

AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
NOVEMBER 17, 2020
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
Aaron Brems	Fire Chief
George Schade	IT Director
Cherylyn Egner	Legal Counsel
Adam Olsen	Senior Planner
Darren Falslev	Police Chief
Derric Rykert	Parks and Recreation Director
Scott Sensanbaugher	Public Works Director

Also, present: Jason Thomson, Mr. Miner, Spencer and Summerisa Stevens, and Kevin Bradburn

The American Fork City Council met in a work session on Tuesday, November 17, 2020, electronically, commencing at 4:00 p.m.

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.

Mayor Frost welcomed everyone to the meeting and read the following statement:

In accordance with Resolution No. 2020-07-20R, I have determined that conducting meetings of the City Council with an anchor location, such as the City Council Chambers or Administration Conference Room, presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present there. The following are facts upon which this determination had been made:

- Utah declared a state of emergency on November 8, 2020 due to an increase in case counts of COVID-19, a virus outbreak that has been recognized by the World Health Organization, federal, state, and local leaders as a pandemic.
- The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has stated that COVID-19 is easily spread from person to person between people who are in close contact with one another through respiratory droplets when an infected person coughs, sneezes, or talks. This virus can also be spread by people who are non-symptomatic.

- Federal, state, and local authorities recommend that individuals limit public gatherings, wear face masks, and follow social distancing guidelines.
- It is difficult to anticipate the number of attendees at any meeting in order to maintain social distancing to comply with State Phased guidelines. Further, regardless of the number of attendees, social distancing measures for Council, staff, and attendees will be difficult to maintain in the City Council Chambers and Administration Conference Room.
- COVID-19 continues to pose an immediate threat to the health, safety, and welfare of American Fork City residents.
- American Fork City can provide a way for the public to hear, or hear and view, open portions of City Council meetings and to provide a way to participate in public hearings.

All City Council meetings will be conducted via electronic means while the written determination is in effect. The meetings are broadcast live-streamed, and available at a later time, at <https://www.americanfork.gov/AgendaCenter>.

1. Discussion on the Harrington Center long-term facility proposal.

Mr. Stevens thanked the Mayor Frost, City Council members, and the staff for their time and presence at the meeting. He introduced Summerisa Stevens as the President of the Harrington Center for Arts, Mr. Miner as the individual who chaired the Physical Facilities Committee, and Kevin Bradburn as the CEO of a family of financial companies they worked with.

Ms. Stevens shared a screen with the meeting attendees. Mr. Stevens gave a quick summary of the work they had done to date. He stated that one of the first things they had done was commissioned a demand study. The study looked at what was needed and viable in order to create an arts center for American Fork and the surrounding areas. He explained that the next thing they did was put together a team of architects to look at the architectural feasibility for the project. He mentioned the architects and consultants who had completed the study and explained that they had looked at the programming of the building, massing and concept development, schematic design, and cost estimates.

Mr. Stevens stated that over the past year they had focused on their financial plans. He further stated that they had refined their operation business model to determine a preferred development structure and how to fund the project. Mr. Stevens mentioned that over the past few years they had done a lot of programs for community outreach. He explained that they had interviewed with arts organizations and artists. He noted that the study had found a common consensus that there was a need for space to educate, rehearse, perform, and overall to support the arts. He stated that they were conscious of the demographic growth and need for this type of project in the area.

Mr. Stevens said that they were committed in the center to adapt programs to fit the needs that had emerged for the artists in the community. He then outlined a few of the programs that they had already implemented. He mentioned the music and arts festival Fork Fest, the Live from Harrington programs, the chalk arts festival called Chalk it UP, and the Mural exhibit. Mr. Stevens noted that over the past year they had supported 314 local artists that had been impacted by COVID. He also noted that they had a total of 12,156 community members who had participated in the events.

Ms. Stevens discussed details about the building itself. She explained that as they had gone back through records for American Fork, they had found that revitalization efforts for downtown American Fork had been a major focus since the 1960s. American Fork had invested a lot of resources into revitalization. They had found demand studies that dated as far back as 1965. Ms.

Stevens said that they felt that community revitalization was possible through renovation, especially that of historic structures. She further said that in their studies they had found that the incorporation of older and historic structures into renovation plans could jumpstart the revitalization of communities. She expressed that historic preservation in and of itself was like a kind of marriage, as it reflected smart growth and expansion on the urban core that currently existed.

Ms. Stevens then showed images of the historic Harrington School. She explained that it was built in 1903 and was recognized as the birthplace of public education west of the Mississippi. She stated that the school was named after the first Mayor and State legislator Leonard Harrington. She then showed some pictures of the building's interior as it sat today.

Ms. Stevens said that they wanted to talk about American Fork's core civic and historic center. She noted that as they had looked through the studies that had been performed over the past 50 years, they had noticed that both Church Street and Center Street served as the core civic and historic center of the City. She walked through the various buildings in that area, which included the corner of City Hall, the Harrington School before its expansion, the connection to the City Jail, the adjacent Science Hall, and The Apollo in the background. Ms. Stevens declared that it really was the public commons for American Fork.

Ms. Stevens went back to the 1938 map when the names of the streets were changed. Harrington Street had become Main Street, and the old Main Street had first become North Street, and then settled on Pacific Drive. She said that the transfer of economy was done only by the presence of Center Street and Church Street, as well as the north and south parallel roads.

Ms. Stevens provided a map that showed the American Fork core civic and historic center. She expressed that American Fork was unique due to the many civic properties in a small area, as well as all of the historic assets. She mentioned that over the years the historic buildings had been renovated, such as City Hall, Alta Bank, the Presbyterian Church, and Alpine Tabernacle. They felt like the Harrington School was the last piece to revitalization through renovation. Ms. Stevens then highlighted the property that was currently owned by the Bell family trust. She then turned the floor over to Mr. Bradburn, who had worked with their organization on the financial aspects of the project.

Mayor Frost interjected for a moment to publicly offer documents that rendered historic City Hall and the Harrington Building to Ms. Stevens's family. He asked that she drop by his office so he could present her with the documents. Ms. Stevens expressed her gratitude. She then turned the floor over to Mr. Bradburn.

Mr. Bradburn introduced himself. He reiterated that he was the CEO of a family of companies that provided investment banking and advisory services work with relation to real estate projects and securities. He stated his excitement to be a part of the project and expressed his gratitude to work with them. He noted that they had worked together over the last six to nine months to determine the financial viability of renovation of the historical Harrington School. He happily reported that their findings were that there was a demand from local dance studios and art businesses and stated that it made financial sense to renovate the space on a for-profit basis.

Ms. Stevens transitioned to a discussion on the actual renovation of the school and construction. Mr. Miner said he was excited to be at the meeting. He said it was something that they had looked

forward to for a long time, and it represented the next step to move forward with the project. He mentioned that he and his family had been heavily involved in the arts for a while. He noted that three of his four children had chosen to pursue arts related degrees as well. He expressed excitement for the opportunity to serve on the board and to help move the project forward.

Mr. Miner presented the first phase of the plan for renovation and expansion of the Harrington Center for the Arts. He explained that in the center was the Harrington building itself. He then pointed out a narrow strip to the north that they referred to as the connector. He explained that the purpose of the connector was to provide accessibility and vertical transportation systems that were not accommodated in the building as it currently existed but were necessary to satisfy the demands of the current code.

Mr. Miner then stated that to the north of the connector was the studio theater, also known as a black box theater. He expressed that the intention of the theater was that of a flexible performance space that could be used for a variety of events and activities. He recapped that all three things formed phase one of the plan. He also noted that the parking was located on the west side of the building and was in the place of the one-story building that was currently located there. He mentioned that the old building had been used for school district offices, as well as housed a variety of businesses over the years.

Mr. Miner said that one of the important things in renovation of historical structures was to preserve the function, form, details, and overall feeling of the original building. He then presented a few images and stated that, although the building would have a new purpose, the look and feel of the building would be similar to what it had looked like in the 1940s. He stated that it would be recognizable to someone who had been there before renovations. He said that an important part of the renovation was to make it a part of the civic core by way of the preservation of history and its connection to the community.

Mr. Miner showed renderings of the proposal. They were an initial concept of what the connector piece and studio theater may look like. He noted that architecturally, there was a bit of a dilemma with the connection of old and new structures. He expressed the issue that an attempt to make them in the same style and look aesthetically pleasing was a difficult task. Mr. Miner presented the alternate approach to counter the historic building with something new and contemporary. It would be complementary and would let the original building maintain and preserve its unique character.

Mr. Miner showed conceptual images inside the studio theater. He reiterated that the intention was a black box idea, where the space could be configured in a number of different ways. He said that because of the location, the space could be used by several different organizations, and even be used by the City if the need arose. He stated that it would be available to American Fork and other members of the community, in particular the arts organizations that worked with the Harrington Center.

Mr. Miner stated that as part of their study with other architects, they had done initial concept programming on Harrington, the connector, and the studio theater. He discussed the visual plans and pointed out the basement level, main level, and upper level. He noted that the areas were color coded to indicate what the intended use for each space was. He further noted that there was a main foyer that they would discuss in more detail later.

Mr. Miner discussed another study they had done to determine how to approach the Harrington project. He explained that the study looked at how other cities had dealt with similar projects. They had found this study to be very instructive. One similar project had been completed in Provo, and a large issue it had faced was in regard to parking. Mr. Miner expressed that the parking issue in American Fork would need to be solved in order for the project to work. He explained that parking issues had been resolved in Provo through a collaborative approach with private and public entities. The collaboration created a network of parking structures that supported all of the businesses in downtown Provo. They used that approach to take parking demand and distribute it in a way that was effective and efficient.

Mr. Miner expressed that in the last five to ten years, Provo had started to become the cultural center of Central Utah County, and a large part of that was finding a solution for the parking problem they had faced. He stated that as they got into further stages of their proposal, and as City Council started to think about issues of redevelopment, the Provo model could be a helpful model to keep in mind. He further stated that collaboration arrangements between public and private enterprises to create parking structures that were shared by all was a viable solution.

Mr. Miner said that there was a unique set of circumstances and opportunity in the aforementioned two block area of American Fork. He explained that it was very uncommon to have that level of historical preservation, and that oftentimes historical structures were either demolished or spread too far apart. He felt that because there was a large number of historical properties within a two-block radius, they had a unique opportunity.

Mr. Miner stated that the second phase was to turn from Harrington and the connected theater to something that addressed the larger civic needs within the City. They felt that a common plaza would do just that. He explained that it would be located on the eastern side of Harrington and pointed out the Apollo on the other side of the plaza. He noted that the Apollo was easy to incorporate and could be a part of the project but was not necessary for its success.

Mr. Miner expressed that they saw the plaza as a multi-purpose space that could be managed and used by a variety of different entities within the City. He noted that it could be useful to stage for events, provide space for pre and post theater events, or be a rehearsal area. He further noted that it could be a space for a farmer's market, public displays and exhibitions, and speeches. They felt that the plaza would function as the living room of American Fork, where people could gather, share new ideas and be creative in a variety of different ways.

Mr. Miner presented another image. He expressed that there was the question of ownership and maintenance of the plaza area. He stated that the Harrington Organization was more than willing to work with the city whether that meant they owned and managed the plaza independently or acted as a partner in some sort of joint use and ownership. He reiterated that they were extremely interested in how the plaza could serve as a gathering place and a creative forum for the community.

Mr. Miner stated they were on the verge of construction and renovation of the Harrington, as well as some of the other things that needed to happen in the first phase of development. They felt that they had a unique set of circumstances that would not last forever. First was that the Bell family trust had a valuable asset that needed to be renovated. Mr. Miner expressed that without renovation, it would not last much longer. He mentioned that the Bell family trust's position was that they wanted to repurpose and renovate the building. Mr. Miner communicated that the next

unique circumstance was the opportunity zone. He said that it would not be around forever, so they should take advantage of it while it was there.

Mr. Miner discussed that the third circumstance was that they had growth projections for North Utah County. Both new and existing residents were on the lookout for a new cultural center. He mentioned that there were various performance locations around the County, but none were really designed for that purpose. He suggested that they could use those projections as a catalyst for the growth and development of downtown American Fork.

Mr. Miner noted that the last circumstance, which had not been mentioned but the Council was aware of, was augmented public transportation that was planned for the future. Mr. Miner said that worked well with a civic, art-focused campus, because it provided greater access to bring people to the area. He expressed the opinion that those circumstances would not last forever, and that there was a sense of urgency to get something in place and to move the project forward.

Mr. Miner clarified that what that meant was that in Phase 1, Harrington Center and the connector could be done immediately. He noted that this was based on Harrington School's ability to finance, obtain permits, and move forward with the construction. He stated that Phase 1B was the studio theater, and that required a solution to the parking issue before they continued forward. He further noted that there was a parking agreement made several years ago but denoted that this did not necessarily mean that they wanted to go back to that provision. However, they believed that it set a great stage to begin the discussion about a parking solution. Mr. Miner expressed that what they needed from the City Council was both a land lease or acquisition for the property that the theater itself would sit on. They also wanted the City Council's cooperation to creatively solve the parking issues.

Mr. Miner explained that Phase 2 was the addition of the studio theater, as well as the civic and arts plaza. He said that what they needed from the City was a commitment on whether they would agree to a partial closure of Church Street. Mr. Miner said they also needed to know if the City would then participate in the Civic and Arts Plaza design, as well as maintenance and construction, among a number of other things. He communicated that the reason it was significant now was that those decisions determined which direction the studio theater lobby would face.

Mr. Miner stated that if there was no desire for cooperation to close Church Street, it possibly made more sense for them to have the studio theater face west instead. He noted that this would put the entrance closer to the parking lot and provided the opportunity for a potential parking structure on the west side. Mr. Miner acknowledged that there would obviously be a lot more questions further on but wanted to recognize the limited window of opportunity. He noted that it was important they have a general idea of what the progression would look like, but that it was not necessary to know all the exact details before progress was actually possible.

Ms. Stevens said that they wanted to discuss the City's participation for Phase 1B, and they wanted to receive some initial feedback on a land lease or possible acquisition for the studio theater portion of the project.

Mayor Frost noted that he had seen the presentation before and had shared it with a few staff members. He said that with the aforementioned growth of the area, they needed to look at that same growth and determine how they would accommodate City services. He mentioned that one idea he had entertained was in regard to the courts building. He felt that the courts building would

vacate in the future. He further stated that it had used its purpose and was not really functional. He expressed the desire for American Fork to eventually take that building over, and felt that when that happened, they could combine City services together in one location. He said that this created a lot of energy and parking needs, as well as access needs for residents.

Mayor Frost said that another thought in regard to potential issues that surrounded the proximity of the fire station to the project. He explained that the fire station in question was the busiest fire in Utah County, and although that would be augmented when they built a new fire station, they needed to keep that issue in mind. Mayor Frost asked Fire Chief Aaron Brems for call volume data. Fire Chief Brems said that their call volume at the time of the meeting was 3,650, and he felt that they would probably exceed 4,000 by the end of the year. He said that on average they received 11.5 calls a day. Mayor Frost stated that the City would need to feel comfortable with any move that took space away from public safety headquarters. He wanted to assure that it would not inhibit movement in and around the station. He asked Fire Chief Brems for his input.

Fire Chief Brems communicated that he had reviewed the presentation with staff, and they had a number of concerns. One of their main concerns was with regards to parking for staff, fire department, and police department. He stated that the parking lot was heavily used, and that before COVID they had 12,000 people come through the fire station for various events. He mentioned that those events included tours and car seat checks. He reiterated that they were a busy fire station, and that parking was a big concern. Fire Chief Brems expressed another concern they had was the closeness of the new building to the fire station. He stated that the fire station received a lot of deliveries, which included narcotics and medical supplies. He further stated that other stations came to that location to train, and that sometimes they had nowhere else to park except at the apparatus from the other building. He expressed concern that people may park in restricted areas and potentially pin in the fire trucks.

Fire Chief Brems brought up a second concern with regards to the project's proximity to the fire station. He informed them that the staff often worked long shifts, which caused them to sleep at the station at various different times of the day. He was concerned that the noise from the studio theater and events would keep the staff awake. He also mentioned that the fire marshal had pointed out a few issues regarding infrastructure. First, he stated that there was no water line on Center Street, and that the main line down Church Street was only 6 inches. Fire Chief Brems said that additional lines and fire hydrants were required because what existed was not sufficient to supply the demand. He further said that the infrastructure from Pacific Drive down to Main Street would have to be upgraded, and that fire hydrants would have to be added.

The next concern Fire Chief Brems addressed was that of access. He explained that the first units that were paged out to calls responded out to Center Street, and then went north and south from there. However, sometimes they were so busy that they had the units go east. He worried that if they closed the street, they would have issues with access. He felt that the proposed route out of the fire station was too narrow. He stated that the pedestrian traffic in and out of the court and the station made them nervous to respond quickly to urgent calls and to have to navigate through all of that.

Fire Chief Brems mentioned that the fire station did not have a basement, so in the past they had considered the use of that extra land for storage, but ultimately felt like they could not give it up even for staff. He recapped that their main concerns were access, parking, and noise.

Ms. Stevens asked to address a few of the concerns. She stated that in previous discussions with them, they had explained that the aerial view did not show the actual parking stalls, and that they actually had a full lane of access as well as a row of parking between them and the studio theater. She explained that the fire station would also retain the parking to the west of the studio theater, which was on City owned property. She stated that they would not lose all of their parking, instead only a few stalls.

Ms. Stevens also addressed the noise concerns. She stated that they had worked with an architect, and that the studio theater design was soundproof enough as to not cause issues. She further stated that it was not a new problem and had been looked at in a number of other cities who had built similar projects. She explained that sound quality was an important aspect of theater design, and that the sounds from the fire trucks and fire stations would not interfere with the theater. In turn, the sounds from the theater would not affect the fire station. She noted that as for noise at outside events, they would follow all City ordinances.

Fire Chief Brems addressed the Mayor Frost and reiterated that the aforementioned points were the concerns had by himself and his staff. He stated that they needed to look at it in more detail, but that they had concerns now that they had looked at it. He restated that if they closed down the road, it may be wide enough, but only if individuals did not obstruct access. He expressed the opinion that the fire station would be busier after the pandemic ended.

Mayor Frost thanked Ms. Stevens for her input on the issues brought forth by Fire Chief Brems. Mayor Frost asked Police Chief Darren Falslev if he had had a chance to look at the plans.

Police Chief Falslev stated this was the first time he had seen the presentation, but he echoed Fire Chief Brems's concerns and arguments. He also has some additional concerns. He stated that they needed that access, and that if they had construction or an accident on 1st East, access issues could potentially take away the only exit point to respond to emergencies. He also raised concern with the safety issue. He stated that the changes would limit how many points they had to get in and out of the stations, which was a safety issue. He mentioned that they already had issues with the courts in regard to the contractual parking. He explained that they had a parking contract with the courts, and that they were limited on what they had. He did not think that the infrastructure was in place to make it work, or to provide the necessary parking and access points for emergency vehicles.

Mayor Frost expressed the opinion that people did not fully understand the mindset of public safety personnel. He said that public safety personnel think of the worst-case scenario, and all the contingencies so they can move around effectively. Mayor Frost stated that people had asked him why when an ambulance went out did a fire truck go out too. He said people questioned why they would not send a small truck to increase efficiency. He further said that he had posed that question to the Chief, and they had communicated to him that they always thought of the worst-case scenario. He recalled that the Chief had said that they always had to be prepared. Mayor Frost explained that he had asked Fire Chief Brems and Police Chief Falslev for their input so the worst-case scenario could be put on the board.

Mayor Frost inquired about the project from a profitability standpoint. He asked if Phase 1A was sustainable financially. He further asked if they needed to go to the north with additional space, or if they could keep it where it was, renovate it, and keep it profitable.

Mr. Stevens stated that the educational spaces for the arts were not as effective if they did not have a place to showcase that work. He expressed the strong opinion that the theater would be a very utilized space due to its flexibility. He noted that the designs they presented were conceptual, and that they had not actually designed the building yet. He explained that was why they had asked for feedback, to see what could be done to solve the concerns. Mr. Stevens noted that Harrington School could not necessarily accommodate the space of a theater inside, which was why they had looked at the preservation of the school, maximization of revenue in that space, and then the addition of an adjacent performance space outside the school's shell. Ms. Stevens pointed out the parking agreement was already in place and they would leverage that in this development.

City Administrator David Bunker noted that they had mentioned that the project made sense because it was in the opportunity zone. He stated that opportunity zones were a way to currently invest, let sit, and then divest. He further stated that he understood this was a for-profit venture. He asked if the intention was to create the space, grow it, keep the investment for a period of time, and then sell the Harrington space in the future. Mr. Miner replied that was not the intention. He stated that Mr. Stevens and Ms. Stevens had done some particularly good work and research to structure a response to that exact question.

Mr. Stevens stated that it was to curb capital gains, and the longer they held the assets, the more profitable and the better the tax incentives for the investments. He stated that the reason they leveraged that as a for-profit venture was that the charity Harrington Center for the Arts would be a long-term lease of the building and would control all of the operations. He explained that this allowed them to leverage both the for-profit and nonprofit sides for maximum potential. He further explained that the long-term intent of development was that the Harrington Center for the Arts would acquire back the building after the investors had received what they deserved back from their investment. Mr. Stevens stated that it would go back to the long-term vision for financial viability. Mr. Bunker replied that it was circular. He recapped that the plan was to sell it here, but to buy it back after opportunity zone criteria had been met.

Council Member Shelton stated that it was an avenue to create capital. He was glad to see the creative use and was excited about the project. He mentioned that he had heard it discussed in a number of previous meetings about the revitalization of downtown but noted that they had never had a developer that was ready to go on the project. Council Member Shelton expressed that he was impressed with the progress that had been made, and he felt that this was the best proposal for a true revitalization of the downtown area. He referred back to previous conversations they had had, and felt that they needed to have nightlife downtown, and not just high-density housing. He mentioned that he had sat in on a PARC Tax Committee, and there had been four different arts groups that had asked for arts tax money to build their own art facilities. Council Member Shelton concluded that there was a demand for this type of project in American Fork.

Council Member Shelton stated that he understood the parking issue in downtown American Fork, and further stated that it was something that would not go away. He felt that now that they had a developer ready to go, a CRA would help address some of the parking issues. He mentioned that when he had met with Provo City, they had discussed their opportunity zones, and most of the parking structures were joint ventures. Council Member Shelton felt that there were a lot of positives and demand for the project, and he thought the concerns could be mitigated. He wondered how often the fire engines went down Church Street. Mayor Frost said that they had done so that morning. Council Member Shelton asked about access points and stated that he could not think of another fire station that had dual access like that.

Fire Chief Brems said that all fire stations had dual access. Ms. Stevens questioned how that could be true based on what they had seen at other fire stations. Fire Chief Brems clarified that all fire stations had access all the way around, whether that was a street or something else. He gave the example of Lehi Station 82, and explained that it had a road around the station to allow for them to pull in. He noted that there was a problem in residential areas with the size and noise of the trucks. He explained that it was always dangerous to back up, which was why they almost always entered from Church Street and exited from Center Street. He admitted that there were times with the concurrent call volume that they went out the other direction. This was also contingent on the placement of some of their storage areas and lockers.

Council Member Shelton clarified that he had meant Church Street would not be blocked off completely, and that they would still have access on the northern end. He felt that was just as much of a dual access as he had seen at other fire stations around the county. He said they could and should discuss it further, but overall, he felt that there were other things they could do to mitigate the concern. He said that it was important to have that public safety, and he did not want it to be jeopardized. He brought forward the suggestion to move training exercises to the new lot they planned to purchase. Council Member Shelton noted that some of the concerns would happen anyway with high density housing that had just been approved and said they should think about what they wanted in that area. He expressed his excitement again about the project and said that it was the first time they had really had an investor, knew the financial viability, and could move forward in a great partnership.

Council Member Taylor stated that he knew the demand for the arts. He said that he had been around when Ms. Stevens's father, Dr. Bell, had started this. He mentioned that they had talked about the closure of Church Street as well as parking issues. Council Member Taylor said that all was certainly a viable discussion, but he thought that the needs for the arts, and the need for a well-rounded cultural option like that, would really help with the revitalization of downtown. He thought that they had thrown a lot of resources into consultants and discussions for the revitalization of downtown but felt this project had gone beyond anything that had been discussed. He felt that it was something that could actually happen and actually show results.

Council Member Taylor stated that until now, it had seemed more of a pipe dream that would never happen. He expressed the opinion that this project actually had some traction and that the community would really benefit from it. He acknowledged that there were some issues that they needed to work out in order to cohabitate. He said that the first priority was public safety, but he did not think that precluded them from the ability to come up with a situation that could enhance the cultural elements of American Fork and that gave a viable strategy to move forward. Council Member Taylor felt that it was important that they got behind it and tried to make it happen, with the aforementioned concerns kept in mind. He did not want to discount what Fire Chief Brems and Police Chief Falslev had said but thought they could and should come together because he thought it was something they definitely needed.

Council Member Carroll said that she agreed with both Council Member Shelton and Council Member Taylor. She said that she looked at the chance it gave the downtown and felt this was the best chance they had. She further said they had seen nothing else that would help revitalize the area. She agreed that she did not want to jeopardize safety in any way but thought they should take a closer look to try and come up with a solution. She stated that she had hoped they would not get rid of parking, but instead they would rearrange and reconfigure. She personally thought

that was viable, and she overall thought the plaza was a great idea. She felt that it could have so many cultural and civic uses, as well as arts, and that it gave them the best chance for a downtown.

Council Member Christiansen expressed that she was excited about it. She said that they needed to take a closer look at the noise concern. She cautioned that it was not just the noise from the soundproofed theater, but also the people who entered and exited the facility. She said that overall, she likes the idea.

Council Member Barnes stated that he had enjoyed the discussion. He said that it seemed like every time one of the discussions took place, more people were brought in and more information was provided, which he felt was always good for discussion. He expressed that he had a couple of comments and questions. Council Member Barnes first asked for clarification about the closure of the street. He asked if it would only close in the middle and asked if both the north and south would still retain access into Church Street. His second question was whether or not it was a possibility to put the theater on the west side of the school rather than the north. He acknowledged that there was less room there but wondered if it was feasible.

Mr. Miner responded that the on the proposal, Church Street was only closed from the north of Harrington to the City Hall. He explained that the area south of that out to Center Street, and then from that point north to Pacific Drive would remain open. He stated that the fire station would still have two aprons west and east, they would have through traffic, and they would be able to load the vehicle bay from both sides as they currently did. Mr. Miner explained that the reason they had proposed to keep that south section was that they wanted to have a place where they could have accessibility. He said that it would put those with mobility challenges as close to the entrance as possible. He reiterated that yes, the section they proposed to close and convert to a plaza was, in reality, a small section. He said that the accesses to all business north and south of Harrington center would remain intact.

Mr. Miner then addressed Council Member Barnes's second question. Mr. Miner explained that there were a number of different positions that had been explored in their study. He said the theater could be moved to the west, but that caused two downsides. The first downside was that it would wipe out the best located parking lot to serve the Harrington building. The second downside was that, as a historical building, there were only two historic facades which were located on the east and west. Mr. Miner explained that if they put the theater on the west it would bury one of the historical facades. It also created the dilemma where the public plaza would be on the opposite side of the building from the studio theater. He referred back to the rendering they had shown earlier. He stated that ideally what happened was that the studio theater entrance would function as part of the plaza space. He summarized that only if the theater were placed on the north would they preserve the two beautiful facades, have the parking situated in the best place, and have the entrance onto the plaza.

Council Member Barnes thanked Mr. Miner for his clear and concise answers. Council Member Barnes asked Fire Chief Brems if this explanation of the closure of Church Street was made aware to him, and if the new details made a difference to Fire Chief Aaron Brems' concerns. Fire Chief Brems stated they had looked at the plans in great detail a few days prior. He reiterated that it was extremely close to the fire station, and he worried about access. He stated that even though they still had the aprons, there were potential accessibility issues with trucks and deliveries in front of the fire station. He mentioned the narrow roads and restated that they had a lot of access concerns. He stated that they worked the worst-case scenario and felt that it would just hamper response

times. He said that they would do what they were told to do but wanted to express their concerns that it would affect public safety. He also said that more of a concern than anything was the noise and foot traffic. He expressed the opinion that even though the building had a soundproofed design, there was still potential noise from car traffic.

Council Member Barnes suggested that it may be possible to do some reconfiguration about how and where deliveries took place in order to keep the roads open. He said that they did not need to express it at the time but wanted to throw out some ideas to think about.

Council Member Barnes concluded his portion with a few comments. Overall, he thought it was wonderful that there were people that were so far ahead with very definite plans. He stated that in the past he had heard a lot of good ideas but admitted that this was the first real presentation that had been made to address an issue that had been discussed heavily and frequently. He noted there had been frequent discussions about how to revitalize downtown. He expressed that he thought they all understood that there would be the addition of high-density housing and that there were a lot of changes to come in the future. He felt things would move forward and stated the opinion that a civic downtown area was an ideal situation to tie everything together.

Council Member Barnes acknowledged Fire Chief Brems' concerns but felt that there was still a lot of room to discuss and work it out. He thought that they could find a win-win situation between all the affected parties. He stated that he was in favor of advancement of the project and further discussions. He conditioned that he was interested in discussions that would work toward a resolution, and not just for discussion's sake.

Council Member Shelton thought that this highlighted an increased need for a transportation study downtown. He expressed the opinion that if they were worried about parking and foot traffic brought by this project, that they should think about the traffic that the recently approved high density housing would bring. Council Member Shelton felt that they needed to get a hold of transportation in the downtown area, especially if UTA was to come in and shut down lanes to put in public transit. He saw that as more of a threat to public safety than the Harrington project.

Mayor Frost said that he needed help on what the next steps to take were, and what they needed from American Fork to move forward. He said that they did not need to go into it further that night but asked for them to prepare a concise list of what they needed from the City. He acknowledged that they knew parking was one need and stated that they needed to discuss a parking plan, not only with sustainability for their facility, but also the City's facilities so they could cohabitate. He felt that meant that they would need to go vertical. He noted that the City had a contract with the bank for a few years but thought that it could be negotiated.

Mayor Frost noted that they knew parking and the street were assets of the public financially. He asked again that they prepare what assets they had, and whether they were asked or purchased. He said this allowed the City to get a better financial idea. He further said that as a Council they needed to look at the courts building as a buildout for them. Employee numbers and citizen usage needed to be considered in the parking discussion because there were parking demands for that facility.

Council Member Shelton stated that one thing they needed to look at from a City standpoint was whether they were serious about doing a CRA there. He explained that their code did not put a parking requirement on that kind of facility because of the way it was zoned in downtown. He

said that was a requirement as a City because of what they had done with the zoning as a commercial use down there. He felt they needed to have a better understanding of what those requirements were.

Council Member Shelton said that as far as an ask, he thought it was outlined on the screen. He stated that for one Council Member's purview, he was more towards an acquisition than land lease because it was cleaner and had better boundaries. He also stated that he was open to a partial closure for the plaza.

Council Member Taylor reiterated that he thought they needed to talk about the issues in a timely manner so they could proceed. He felt that things had progressed, and that they had to keep public safety in the front of their minds. He thought that they could figure a solution out, and he had no issue in the closure of Church Street from Harrington School south.

Council Member Barnes asked Council Member Taylor how he felt about closure to the north. Council Member Taylor replied that he would not close that access between the PD and the fire station, but he did not necessarily think there was a need there either.

Council Member Barnes asked Mr. Stevens and Ms. Stevens what they wanted the City to do at the moment, and what needed to be done. Ms. Stevens said that what they needed from the City was that as they moved forward with the creation of construction documents, Mr. Bradburn's team had lined up investors and created a great financial model for expenses and income. She said at that point in time they needed an agreement with the City, as they saw the center as the American Fork City Center and not just the Harrington Center for the Arts. She saw the project as a solution to problems that had existed for a long time in downtown. She noted that they knew that there was an agreement for the parking lot, and that it was currently a shared parking lot between the Bell family trust, the fire department, and the businesses. She said that they needed to have real conversations about a new agreement, and they needed to start fresh and determine whether it was a land lease or an acquisition.

Ms. Stevens reminded the Council that they planned to remove the small building to the west, which increased parking. She noted that it would be privately owned but open for public use. She reiterated that they did not want to take away parking, and instead wanted to distribute where people could park in that area. She expressed that it was an important piece of the parking puzzle. She stated that the first step they needed to take was to start real conversations about an agreement, as well as a consensus on where the plaza would go. She noted that they could have stipulations of course, but that determined what direction it would face.

Mr. Miner added that the cleanest way to get to that conversation was for them to prepare a site plan that showed the actual position of the building and configuration of the parking lot. He thought that option gave them the basis to get reviewed by the planning and engineering departments. He also thought it could be used as a basis for any sort of further discussion on acquisition versus lease, and how much and where that property would be. He stated that with their direction, Harrington Center for the Arts was happy to put together a site plan. He thought it was a good first step.

Mr. Bunker agreed with Mr. Miner. Mr. Bunker referenced that Council Member Shelton had mentioned that this project had the best financial viability they had seen to date. Mr. Bunker did not think that the City had seen that financial plan, and thought it was important for the City

Council to see and understand. He stated that if they really planned on a move forward with the project, and the City had to divest of some assets they really wanted to see where that financial viability sits. He also agreed that they would want to look at a new agreement on the right of way. He referenced a comment made by Ms. Stevens about nonprofits and land leases. He noted that this project as a for-profit venture changed the property value.

Ms. Stevens clarified that the studio theater was a nonprofit venture, and the Harrington School and connector were the proposed for-profit ventures to be held by an investment group. She clarified that the part Mr. Bunker had referred to was a nonprofit portion. Ms. Stevens explained that the studio theater was Phase 1B and was the nonprofit portion. She said that there would be a land acquisition from the City. Mr. Bunker said those were details that they needed to understand better.

Mayor Frost addressed Mr. Miner and summarized that they would wait for something more concrete than the provided visuals. He said that he felt that was a good option to help them understand. Mayor Frost wanted to be clear in regard to Phase 3. He inquired about whether or not Phase 1 and 2 had any viability on their own, or if Phase 3 was something that had to happen to make it profitable. He asked if it was something they needed to consider now, even if it was conceptual, because it would have a play on Phase 1 and 2. Ms. Stevens replied that Phase 3 was independent of the viability of Phase 1 and 2.

Council Member Shelton asked if they took away Phase 3 if it would get rid of the arts facility and all they would have was practice classrooms. Ms. Stevens clarified that what they had referred to was the addition of a larger, state of the art facility. She explained that as part of the demand study to determine what was needed in the area, one of the things that a lot of arts organizations had shown interest in was a larger, state of the art theater. The first need was rehearsal and practice space, and then the smaller theater that had flexibility and low rental cost, which allowed a lot more creativity in the community with individual artists. Council Member Shelton thanked Ms. Stevens for the clarification.

Mr. Bunker asked if it was possible to extend the plaza area south in front of old City Hall, and still leave enough space for emergency personnel to go up and down the road. He suggested that they not close it off all the way, and instead narrow that road up so it would be just a lane in each direction. He stated that with that idea the plaza was still in the same location and had the possibility to extend further south in front of City Hall.

Mr. Miner and Ms. Stevens both felt that was a good idea. Mr. Miner explained that one of things they had wrestled with was how to get the plaza connected to Main Street. He said that they had played with a few ideas but felt that the idea of a single lane in both directions combined with an extension of the pedestrian part of the plaza down, was a great idea to get that connected.

Ms. Stevens stated that the plaza design that they had created was very preliminary. It was simply to entice people and help them to see the possibility of a plaza. She further stated that they were in no means stuck with any of the plaza concepts that had been presented. She said that one thing mentioned by Fire Chief Brems in a previous discussion was the possibility of a weight-bearing plaza for the rare case a fire engine needed to use Church Street. She said that they could put in retractable pylons to be available for emergency services. She reiterated that they were not attached to the specific concepts that had been shown, and that they were simply to present an idea

of a plaza. She felt that there were many solutions, especially with the consideration that this was the first conversation.

Council Member Barnes asked if while they completed the site plan, without a lot of extra work and expense, if it were possible to have some variations of different configurations that could work. He felt that it was helpful for them to feel like they covered all of the possibilities to come up with what was the best.

Mr. Miner replied that they actually had those alternative renderings of building configurations as part of the study they had done. He stated that they were happy to share those documents if they needed to have further discussion about the viability of each one before they jumped into the site plan. He explained that the site plan he had in mind was more technical in nature and was based on an actual survey. He suggested that they get the initial concepts to review and then have another discussion offline about that. Council Member Barnes agreed and thanked Mr. Miner.

Mayor Frost felt the conversation had been very productive and thanked them for their attendance.

2. Discussion on the boat harbor improvement grant.

Mayor Frost stated that he would have Mr. Bird get them reoriented with the topic. He explained that he felt this topic was important to add to the agenda because they had a commitment from the TRCC Board. He explained that they had a window to get granted about \$1.3 million, and that they had until 2028 to do that. He said that it was a commitment they had not seen before from the County, and that two other cities had already taken advantage of the opportunity and signed commitments with the county. He said that he wanted to gauge the temperature of the Council again before they gave up the opportunity. He felt that the political climate in the county would change at the turn of the year, and that it would not be available anymore. He stated that in his personal opinion, they had nothing to lose because if they did not put anything into it, they would not receive anything back. He felt good that the commissioners had taken the initiative to put the TRCC money into broad range draws. He reiterated that he feared the window would close, and so he wanted the Council to review it. He mentioned that they had the possibility for development to the north of the area now as well, which they could discuss more in depth at a later date. He asked Mr. Bird to give a quick update.

Mr. Bird explained that the total master plan was a \$5 million project, but what they had submitted and sought funding for was the first phase. This mainly included the boat harbor, which was a \$3 million project and included utilities and a beach front. He said that one of the advantages was that as long as they tried to achieve the goals of the total master plan, they could be flexible in the areas they wanted to focus on. He communicated that the county grant was roughly \$1.5 million, and that they planned to go to them with an agreement with a 50% match, which they thought would be considered and possibly approved. He stated that Saratoga Springs and Vineyard had followed the same course, and that the 50% match was the recommendation. Mr. Bird further explained that at that point it was on American Fork to try and fund the other half through various opportunities and options. He also said that they had a longer period of time to finish it. He noted that he had some options on the image provided, but they could do something else if desired. He said that they needed to decide if they wanted to go to the county commissioners and ask for the agreement. He further said that they had the opportunity to decide what they want to use and how much. Mr. Bird expressed that in the last conversation they had, they wanted to get input from the Parks and Trails committee, who were in favor of it because it gave them options. He said that not all of them were keen on the beach, but they were all in favor of the boat harbor, additional parking,

and park space. He concluded that they sought a general consensus from Council about how they wanted to proceed, and on whether or not they should approach the commission. He reiterated that the Parks Committee was in favor. He also recommended it because it gave them options.

Council Member Carroll asked for clarification about the \$300,000. She thought that when they had decided to not go with the proposal, they had re-allocated the \$300,000 to other projects. Mr. Bird confirmed that they had. He then clarified the scenario presented was a hypothetical 50% match. He explained that what he had proposed was just options.

Council Member Carroll asked if in kind that would be work from City staff. Mr. Bird confirmed that it would be labor and resources, and that they could demo the current parking lot and remove the product and dispose of it.

Mayor Frost explained that the thing that had changed in his mind was that they had until 2028, and that they did not have to match the grant all at once. He also reiterated that what they did not match, they did not get. He stated that they were not committed in a way that there was a penalty. It was there if they needed it and chose to use it, which depended on how they budgeted for it. He also said that the PARC Tax would need to be renewed before then as well. He just felt that they needed to keep their options open and have the agreement in place. He did not believe that there was a notion that because they had given the city a certain amount of money, it took away their ability to receive funds from another source for Art Dye or similar things.

Council Member Carroll recapped what Mayor Frost said to ensure she understood correctly. She asked for clarification that if they could only commit over time \$500,000 that the county would still give the City \$500,000. Her statement was confirmed.

Council Member Shelton said that his original concerns were the improvements such as the sand beach. He said it seemed like déjà vu as they had done it just a few years prior. He expressed that his interest was not in those improvements, but felt a better use was improvements in the infrastructure. This included things like the parking lot. He asked if there was anything that they could do with all the excess concrete and rebar that was there. He felt that it did not make sense to have a new sandy beach with all the rebar there in the water. He gave the opinion that if they did the improvements, he preferred to put money towards those infrastructure items.

Mayor Frost stated that he did not have an exact answer but knew that one of the commissioners had said that they had the ability to be flexible. He said that he would ask but felt that from the tone of previous conversations it was an acceptable thing to use the money for. Council Member Shelton said the details he wanted to know in the contract when it came to approval was what the flexibility was. He noted that the individuals that said there was flexibility would not be the same individuals when the time came to enforce it. He said that the legal agreement needed to be written in such a way to specify it.

It was also mentioned that another thing to be considered was that the vision was it would be a trail that surrounded the entire lake. He stated that as the trail system figured in, it would probably be a headgate to it where the parking lot was.

Council Member Carroll wanted to hear more insight on the conversation that had happened with the Parks and Recreation Committee. She said that one of her concerns was that the committee wanted a park, and the money would come from the same pool. She expressed concern that it

would be a tradeoff where they would receive this instead of land acquisition for a park. Mr. Bird stated that it was mentioned in their meeting as well. He said that they saw it as an opportunity for park space, and as a recreational benefit for the community. Mr. Bird thought that if the Parks and Recreation Committee were to prioritize these things they would see if they can leverage to create a park space. Mr. Bird stated that they would want to be aware of the impact fee usage, but thought they were open to it. He reiterated that this just gave them different options. He said that they did not necessarily want to compromise on the other items, but may understand the need to make it a priority given a specific timeline, as long as they did not compromise on the attempt to acquire property elsewhere in addition.

Mayor Frost asked for some direction or input. He thought PARC Tax Board and the Council understood that they did not have anything to lose, unless they felt there was score-keeping that took place at the commission level with allocations of funds to a certain City. He stated that the commission looked at it as an asset for the county, not just American Fork City, as it was one of the few places with access to Utah Lake. He said that was why they granted it to Saratoga and Vineyard, because they wanted the lake to be used to its fullest potential.

Council Member Barnes thought to some extent that people always kept track and kept score. He expressed the opinion that he did not understand why they had always lost in relation to other cities in the county. However, he thought that if they were given it, at some point it could come back and be brought up. He was originally opposed, and he still was in a sense since he personally did not use the facility down there at all, and he did not know how many people actually used it. His concern was whether or not they would get value for the money they actually spent. He restated that they could start it, but only received money if they actually spent money. He also reviewed that if they did not take the opportunity, he did not think they would have that change again in the future. He communicated that with those two ideas in mind, he was in favor of the opportunity because it posed no foreseeable risk.

Council Member Christiansen asked what sort of conditions they put on what the City was allowed to spend the money on. She asked if they would have to okay those choices. Mayor Frost said that he thought the conditions were what they had submitted to them, but it was also expressed that there was some flexibility from what the City presented to the commission. Mr. Bird noted that they were familiar with the whole master plan and thought that as long as they worked to achieve the overall goal with the funds, he felt they would be fine.

Mayor Frost asked where they stood and wanted to see whether they should put in the effort or not. He communicated that he was comfortable either way but did advocate for it. He said it would not break his heart if they did not go in that direction, but thought there were some obvious gains, especially the trailhead. He noted that there was a \$2.3 million of the first part of the trail system that was to be MAG funded outside of the grant. He explained that it was the American Fork section, which would lead into the area. He said that was something submitted by the county itself and not the City. He stated that it could be the start of a trail system but was not overly concerned. He noted that if they wanted to take a water and sewer line to the project, it was in the budget.

Council Member Carroll agreed with Council Member Barnes that it made sense to give themselves the option with the understanding that they could revisit what projects they spent money on in the future. She recapped that they doubled their money with a lot of flexibility. It was stated that they would have to discuss budgetary items further in a budget session. Council

Member Christiansen agreed that they should go ahead and pursue it. Council Member Shelton was okay with the flexibility but wanted to make sure that the contract was sufficient, and he thought the funds could improve the harbor. Council Member Taylor agreed with Council Member Shelton. Council Member Taylor thought that they had a tremendous asset, and he was okay to move forward as well.

3. Discussion on awarding Alpine Community Theater an additional \$20,000 of PARC Tax funds.

Mr. Bird explained that the specific amount was \$18,840. He explained that when ACT received their awarding, they had two options. The lesser amount was on the condition that the City sponsored events and offered support. He further explained that as they had recently started to schedule out their Christmas event, we determined that it was significantly more complicated with the insurance and was something that they normally tried to avoid. He stated that the alternative was to fund the reservation fees so that ACT could hold their events. He said that they thought it may come in at less than \$18,840 because they may not have as many shows as had originally been planned, which was what created the agenda item. He explained that they wanted input from Council and whether or not they wanted to allow this to happen. He stated that there were sufficient funds in the PARC Tax, and they could afford it. He noted that any of the additional revenue would be rolled over into the next PARC Tax program year, and so they would reduce it by \$18,840 less the next year. He had talked to the PARC board and they were in favor of it.

Council Member Shelton was in favor. He stated that they had originally decided to take applications on an annual basis, but it was understood that changes could be made during the year. He asked if it would be on the next Council agenda for action to amend the current contract. Legal Counsel Cherylyn Egner stated they could do a separate contract for the funds, or a simple amendment to the other contract. It was said that it would go back to Council.

Council Member Taylor said that the PARC Tax was nearly all unanimous in their support, and thought it was a great idea.

Council Member Christiansen expressed the opinion that they should treat all entities the same. Council Member Carroll said she was fine with it. Council Member Barnes said he was fine as well.

4. Adjournment.

The work session adjourned at 5:56 p.m.



Terilyn Lurker, City Recorder