

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Work Meeting Minutes

12:00 PM, Tuesday, August 24, 2021

Electronic meeting <https://www.youtube.com/provocitycouncil> or 351 W Center Street, Provo, UT 84601

Agenda ([0:00:00](#))

Roll Call

The following elected officials participated:

Council Chair David Sewell, conducting
Council Vice-chair David Shipley
Councilor David Harding
Councilor Bill Fillmore
Councilor Shannon Ellsworth
Councilor Travis Hoban, arrived 2:32 PM
Mayor Michelle Kaufusi

Excused: Councilor George Handley

Prayer

The prayer was offered by Councilor Shannon Ellsworth.

Approval of Minutes

August 3, 2021 Work Meeting
Approved by unanimous consent.

Business

1. A presentation regarding the Administration's proposal for a COVID-19 vaccine campaign. (21-089) ([0:12:48](#))

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi presented. Mayor Kaufusi shared experiences from the Mayor's Office during the pandemic. The Utah County Health Department has been a great community partner, along with the Council who has supported efforts to promote the health and safety of the community. Eric Edwards, Utah County Health Department Director, also presented. Mr. Edwards shared details of the County's ongoing efforts to promote vaccination against COVID-19. He believes the plans to be shared today will increase the health department's impact and effectiveness in the community with the City's partnership. Some of the initiatives include:

- Mobile COVID-19 vaccine clinic for Rock the Canyon event on August 28
- Collaboration between County and City emergency managers on outreach

- Utah County is also working with every city in Utah County regarding vaccine equity and making vaccines accessible to underrepresented communities with low vaccination rates
- Drive-through vaccine clinics throughout the County; mobile vaccine van purchased through a grant from the State health department for more outreach with vaccines

Wayne Parker, CAO, presented. Mr. Parker shared an overview of the plan. He highlighted data from the current status of vaccinations in Utah County:

- 552,000 doses of vaccine given to Utah County residents
- 261,000 Utah County residents are fully vaccinated
 - Represents 61% of eligible adults
 - Represents 41% of total County population
 - Average rate in Utah is 47%
- BYU has 76% of faculty and staff, and 70% of incoming students vaccinated

Mr. Parker reviewed the recommendations from Casey Gifford's study from the BYU MPA program. The study recommended connecting individuals with medical professionals, make vaccine process convenient and easy, and offer incentives. Mr. Parker shared some of their thinking surrounding incentives and why they do not plan to pursue incentives as part of the plan. While incentives have been shown to be effective, using incentives in this scenario creates some problematic situations which could set a bad precedent for future public health administration as well as introduce controversy. The data suggests that offering incentives represents a high cost for a low return on investment of tax dollars.

Mr. Parker outlined the guiding principles for the plan:

- Utah County Health Department takes the lead, supported as needed by City resources
- Focus on messaging through trusted health professionals; trust in government is inconsistent and for health subjects, they prefer to rely on trusted professionals
- Leverage effective community partnerships with UCHD, parent associations, medical associations, and other relevant community partners
- Focus on improving access to vaccines by removing barriers and engaging the medical community, such as transportation and convenience
- Provo and Utah County should both provide resources from available funding sources to "prime the pump"
- Outreach efforts should amplify the messages already being promoted by UCHD, the Utah Department of Health, and other reputable sources of information

Mr. Parker outlined the key objectives of the plan: to engage healthcare professionals, to research the key barriers to vaccines locally, to support UCHD's efforts to improvement outreach and engagement with target audiences, and to share the resources developed with other Utah cities.

Mr. Parker elaborated on each of these objectives, after which he invited questions and comments from the Council. Councilor David Harding thanked the administration for presenting their thorough and detailed plan. Mr. Harding thought the healthcare professional panel was key; Mr. Parker elaborated on some of the organizations they were working with and involving in the efforts. Mr. Harding also commented on incentives, noting that there could be other kinds of incentives which were not as blatant but still effective. Mr. Parker addressed this feedback; the

Administration felt some of those examples cited by Mr. Harding were already part of their outreach plans and strategy.

Councilor David Sewell thanked the Administration; he feels immense gratitude and relief knowing that Provo is doing what it can to provide resources to help the community during the pandemic. Councilor Shannon Ellsworth thanked the Administration as well. She shared a humorous idea of creatively incentivizing students to get vaccinated by letting them out of one parking ticket by being vaccinated.

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi said they would continue to bring updates to the Council. After they hold their first panel with medical professionals, they'd love to report on that. Provo has also offered the information and designs produced to other cities. She noted that issues in Provo affect Utah County, as our daytime population swells with people employed in Provo from other parts of the county. Mr. Sewell thanked the Mayor and Administration for their knack for creating partnerships and working with other agencies. *Presentation only.*

2. Presentation on Provo River Delta Restoration Project and possible impact on Provo Airport. (21-083) ([0:56:21](#))

Dave Decker, Public Works Director, presented. Steve Gleason, Airport Manager, is present on Zoom, and Mr. Decker was also joined by Brian Torgersen, Public Services Division Director, and Jimmy McKnight, Public Works Budget Analyst. Mr. Decker's wanted to help the Council understand the potential impacts to the airport of the Provo River Delta Restoration project. He clarified that his intent was not to alter the direction of that project, but to inform the Council of their concerns. Mr. Decker spoke about their ongoing concerns about bird strikes, which is a major issue that is top of mind for airport staff. They also have concerns about the ongoing maintenance responsibilities of the natural and vegetative elements of the delta area. Staff are exploring the possibility of installing wildlife monitoring systems to protect the airport.

Question from Shannon Ellsworth. Dave Decker responded that maintenance will likely tie to the likelihood of bird strikes in the future; they are keeping an eye on how the project is managed through the Division of Wildlife Resources. Ms. Ellsworth asked what the Council should do to proactively ensure the results needed for the City. Mr. Decker indicated that ongoing monitoring of the project, keep an eye on management, and to bring any items not being adequately addressed to the property owner or responsible party.

Councilor David Sewell asked about long-term maintenance and how the project would be transferred to a local entity to manage. Mr. Decker indicated that the mitigation commission's typical process is to transfer projects to one of the state agencies. He indicated that the project managers for these entities have typically never had projects in such close proximity to a regional or international airport, so that raised some concerns. *Presentation only.*

3. Presentation on the General Plan. (21-061) ([1:23:14](#))

Robert Mills, Planning Supervisor, and Becky Zimmermann and Alison Bourquin of Design Workshop presented. Ms. Bourquin explained that over the last couple months, they have

worked with an environmental consultant on the sustainability plan's baseline assessment and benchmarking study. She shared details about some of the other communities selected for the benchmarking portion of the study, noting that they sought out communities of a similar size, which were located in the mountains, university towns, and cities with current sustainability actions already in place. Ms. Bourquin shared the baseline dashboard preview—she noted that some data categories did not have data in Provo, such as the tree canopy. Ms. Bourquin shared other categories that could be measured in Provo, such as impervious surfaces or albedo (a light pollution term). She invited suggestions from the Council, noting that the baseline dashboard would be the foundation for creation of targets and metrics moving forward. She suggested using a data point that is already readily available and trackable.

Councilor Shannon Ellsworth was interested measuring with tree canopy as many other cities have done, as trees also help with carbon emissions. Ms. Ellsworth suggested another idea of hours spent outdoors (since people usually stay indoors when there is poor air quality). Councilor David Sewell suggested using the average air quality index or water table level as measures.

Turning to the General Plan process, Ms. Bourquin shared the vision statement which has become the driving force of the plan. She outlined the process moving forward and key milestones in the process. The future land use map is used as a visual guide for future planning. Some questions and points of discussion which have arisen during the process, including:

- Clarification about overlay districts for downtown and transit-oriented development
- Outdoor resources and access to outdoors is a core community value. Parks and recreation areas are currently identified as public facilities on land use map; they intend to make better distinctions on the maps for parks moving forward.
- Light industrial and high industrial to create a scale of intensity that is a better visual representation

They are interested in the Council's feedback about how the future land use map can be a useful tool for them in the future; Ms. Zimmermann asked the extent of the Council's current reliance on the future land use map. Councilor David Harding asked whether this future land use map incorporated the future land use maps from neighborhood plans. Mr. Mills indicated that they are generally updated concurrently. Mr. Harding said that when he reviews rezone requests, he typically looks at the neighborhood plans, which often have additional context at a very localized level. He said he was very much influenced by the plans that were already in place. In response to a follow-up question from Ms. Zimmermann regarding whether they preferred the style of the existing future land use map (more detailed regarding uses and specific properties) or whether they would prefer a more general map, Mr. Harding indicated that he preferred a higher level, more general map. He cited the Southwest Area Future Land Use Map as an example he liked, as it allowed room for more specifics to follow in a development proposal, and the map itself remained fairly simple in nature with large bubbles indicating general uses in broader areas.

Councilor Bill Fillmore was in favor of the less specific, more general “fat marker” style of map that Ms. Zimmermann described. Councilor Shannon Ellsworth shared her concerns and comments. As a Councilor, she did not want to rehash the same discussions ad nauseum every time a rezone decision came before the Council. She would love a solution or system that would allow the Council to make more intuitive decisions or to help guide future decisions.

Ms. Bourquin reviewed the final themes and commitments. She also asked if there were any elements that were missing in their plans. Ms. Bourquin invited comments from the Council on that regard. Councilor Bill Fillmore commented on conservation and stewardship of the outdoors which were important community values. Councilor Shannon Ellsworth said there is a struggle in the city with welcoming different housing types and perhaps that should be integrated into this welcoming community element. Ms. Zimmermann indicated that was addressed in a later goal.

Councilor David Harding had some feedback about the vision statement and language generally. He is part of the working group that has met with Design Workshop and he has appreciated the conversations they have had. By sharing his comments with the Council, he hoped to identify whether or not other Councilors felt similarly and perhaps the collective input could inform the process moving forward. Mr. Harding thought the vision statement felt like a word salad; he felt a more specific, clearer vision would be helpful. More broadly, he thought if the general plan used language from either end of the political spectrum it may be alienating in our community.

Ms. Ellsworth suggested that might simply be the result of different people interpreting words differently. She shared the Merriam-Webster definition of equity: “freedom from bias or favoritism.” Perhaps this was a broader idea which was not politically charged. Ultimately, she hoped the City could pick a vision that accurately reflects the wishes for Provo. She also hoped the statements could capture the idea that Provo should be the leader, the heart of the County, and an economic center in the valley, as a center of power, momentum, and movement.

Mr. Fillmore underscored Mr. Harding’s concern; with highly divisive partisan politics, he thought fairness may be a better choice of word. Councilor David Sewell shared some concerns about use of “social equity” which might be a political trigger word for some people. Mr. Mills reminded the these are not words that they came up with; these are words that came out of the process which involved the community. Mr. Mills noted that words are powerful, and these words have been specifically chosen because they were powerful and dynamic. Ms. Bourquin indicated that Design Workshop would continue to work with Mr. Mills and staff. They also hope to continue engaging the Council in these conversations. *Presentation only.*

4. A presentation from the Parking Committee. (21-028) ([2:25:39](#))

Hannah Salzl, Planner, introduced the presentation. The proposed plan from the Parking Committee offers flexible solutions for meeting the different parking needs in the City. Javin Weaver, Planner, presented. He read the different elements of the proposed plan on which they hoped to get additional feedback from the Council. As Mr. Weaver reviewed elements of the plan, Councilors asked questions and shared comments on the plan’s contents.

Regarding the possibility of a neighborhood-wide permit, Councilor David Sewell asked whether that meant that a program for the entire Joaquin area would be authorized, with only portions enacted based on the Administration’s discretion. Mr. Weaver indicated that understanding was correct. Councilors David Sewell, David Harding, and David Shipley were supportive of that aspect of the plan based on Mr. Weaver’s clarification. Councilor Bill Fillmore said there had been some pushback from landlords in the area who feel like they have not been consulted. Mr.

Weaver indicated that the committee has included a representative who manages properties in Joaquin, as well as the neighborhood chair and members of the BYU community. Mr. Sewell also noted that the apartment owner who has participated in the committee process has tried to facilitate outreach with the landlord community. Mr. Harding also noted that the committee held many surveys and focus groups. Outreach will be a continuous effort in the community.

Councilor Shannon Ellsworth asked whether there was there any section of the student and rental population that saw this proposal favorably. Ms. Salzl indicated that they have not taken this specific plan to any other groups; the intent was to bring it to the Council first to gauge the direction of the program which would then be presented to the public. Generally students agree there is a parking problem in Joaquin and the permit or program costs is usually their main concern. They held a focus group with students and everyone who has walked through the scenarios and understood the process has reached the same end solution of a parking permit program. Ms. Salzl indicated that as long as students don't pay an undue or burdensome amount in parking fees, those who were familiar with the plans were supportive.

Ms. Ellsworth's top concern is that she has heard mixed feedback from long-term residents of the area, and that from students she has heard that there *isn't* support. Ms. Salzl indicated that her comments were the result of the feedback from survey efforts and focus groups. As with any proposal, some people will be in favor and some will be opposed. She indicated that once there was direction from the council, they will get more feedback from the community. Mr. Fillmore thought that community feedback should engage community members with an educational aspect as well, in order to get the best possible feedback. Mr. Harding added that even some community members who carefully consider the plan may still view it negatively if it conflicts with their personal interest. Mr. Harding commented on the variety of properties with or without existing on-site parking in the Joaquin area.

Regarding having two types of parking management options in the neighborhood (timed parking and permit parking), Councilors were generally supportive of having both or either. Regarding the program cost being flexible and based on demand, Mr. Shipley voiced concerns about an unfettered market-based system. He suggested a system which was market-influenced but perhaps not market-based. Mr. Fillmore echoed similar concerns. Ms. Ellsworth was not fully convinced that a permit parking program was necessary. She preferred doing a pilot program and allowing flexibility, evaluation of data, and that the City look at alternatives for scaling the concept and approach in a measured way. For fees or rates, she agreed that creating an upward threshold is a good step and the Council can reevaluate if needed.

Mr. Weaver asked the Council about fees, including whether the Council wished to set a maximum fee limit for timed parking and what the permit fees should be for permit parking. Councilors commented on possible fees and suggested the fees not be too high. Ms. Ellsworth asked what the Carterville permit parking area program fee of \$100 was based on. Mr. Weaver indicated that the Carterville fee was based on the data of what would be an effective and self-sufficient program enforcement-wise.

Mr. Weaver asked about any other elements or factors they should consider while evaluating the proposal, including a trial period. Mr. Sewell suggested they consider the general criteria that

students (the primary occupants) should feel like their quality of life has improved because of more convenient access to parking. If students don't feel their lives have been made better, he did not think we have accomplished our goals. He also suggested ensuring that owners of homes and businesses in the area are not negatively impacted by a permit parking program. Mr. Shipley suggested the Council not set a rigid timeline for the trial period—he thought a lot of questions would be answered in a relatively quick amount of time such as a few months. He suggested they evaluate things like the challenges for enforcement, market-based pricing, etc. and react to live data in a shorter time frame. Ms. Ellsworth agreed with Mr. Sewell's comments about students' quality of life—if the permit parking program did not improve outcomes for students, renters, and people who live in Joaquin, then the City needed to reevaluate the program. Mr. Sewell responded to Mr. Shipley's comment and agreed that they should adjust more quickly to the early data. He suggested the 2 year trial period as proposed in the plan constitute an upper limit, rather than a prescriptive duration. *Presentation only.*

5. A presentation regarding the Development Process: "Context: How design, density, and aesthetics interact" (21-080) ([3:00:02](#))

Robert Mills, Planning Supervisor, presented. He hoped this would be an interactive discussion and he planned to address several important parts of planning and how communities come together: density, diversity, and context. There are many connotations about the concept of density. Mr. Mills indicated that it could be measured in the number of units per a designated area or in number of persons per area. In Provo, most commonly we use the measure of number of dwelling units per acre. Density is simply division. It can be manipulated very easily by changing the number of people or the amount of space being discussed. Mr. Mills displayed two images and asked which had a higher density. These images actually have the same density—it's division based on number of units or people and the space. More than the number, the question of how it looks, feels, and functions is more important. High density is often associated with a particular type of product, but that is not necessarily the case.

Another important element is diversity—diversity in aesthetics allows for a more visually pleasing neighborhood, but also allows for cohesion. This also contributes toward the vitality of a neighborhood, as a diverse housing mix allows for a broader cross section of demographics. Context refers to the right place, the right time, and the right way. Context changes based on location. There are some great examples in Provo of contextually correct developments in Provo. In conclusion, Mr. Mills reiterated that density is not a problem, it's simply a measurable result. Design plays a large role in the perception of density. Diversity in aesthetics is more than just good looks. A diversity of housing types allows for integrated neighborhoods and aging in place. The appropriate context for developments makes a difference.

Councilor Shannon Ellsworth thanked staff for preparing this presentation—it represents best practices in the planning industry and what staff are trying to promote and develop as ideal circumstances in Provo. Cliff Strachan, Council Executive Director, asked how to bring the community along in understanding these concepts. The Council has a responsibility as the land use authority, but perhaps they could better engage the community in understanding the elements at play. Mr. Mills said this was a great question. He thought planning should be a very publicly engaged process. Education plays an important role. Educating the community about why a

project makes sense, but also it is important to include education about the reasons and the vision for why it fits in. Mr. Mills also suggested Provology which is a great place to provide this education. Educating at every opportunity makes the process better. *Presentation only.*

6. Presentation on return of Winter Olympics to Utah. (21-090) ([3:16:54](#))

Fraser Bullock, Salt Lake City-Utah Committee for the Olympic Games President and CEO, presented. Mr. Bullock explained that they are in an active bid for the Olympics. He shared a snapshot of the current bid environment, which has changed dramatically from the past. Mr. Bullock reviewed the steps they have taken so far to become a contender in the bid for the Olympics—currently they are deciding between whether to aim for the 2030 or 2034 games. One concern of bidding for 2030 is the recency of the 2028 games in Los Angeles. Domestic sponsorships are an important revenue source for the Olympics host city, so it may be more advantageous to put space out two United States games. Strong contenders for the host city are Sapporo, Japan; Vancouver, Canada; and Barcelona, Spain. If Vancouver wins a bid for 2030, it is unlikely that the International Olympic Committee would locate the next winter games in North America as well. Mr. Bullock shared details of the operating team for the Utah committee. He also outlined the technical work required which they are currently working through.

Mr. Bullock reviewed the key elements of a Venue Use Agreements, which they need with each of the Olympic venues, including periods of use (either exclusive or non-exclusive), use of spaces, control of commercial rights, economics (rental and other costs, revenue offset for the venue to keep them economically whole), and the roles and responsibilities of each party. They hope to take a collaborative, partnership approach with the City so that use of the Peaks Ice Arena is a mutually beneficial arrangement. Mr. Bullock shared an update on the VUAs status for the different types of venues throughout the Wasatch front.

There are several proposed improvements for the Peaks Ice Arena. The primary purpose is significant improvement for the community's everyday use. Another benefit is that the improvements would meet the requirements for hosting the future Olympic Games. The Utah committee is currently sourcing funding for the improvements. Specific improvements will include expanded seating, expanded multi-use space, improved locker rooms, and a new entrance. Mr. Bullock invited comments or questions from the Council.

Councilor Bill Fillmore hoped that Mr. Bullock could share a breakdown of where the \$8 million in project costs would be coming from. At a high level, Mr. Bullock indicated that they envisioned \$2 million from Provo City, \$2 million matched by Utah County, and then the final \$4 million as a match from the State. Cliff Strachan, Council Executive Director, asked about the timeline on the funding and the construction of the improvements. Mr. Strachan also wondered whether there would be expanded parking. Mr. Bullock indicated that by the end of the year they hope to know whether they are aiming for 2030 or 2034. The VUAs should be completed by this fall. He thinks that the sooner the improvements are done, the sooner that is a benefit to the City. Showing the commitment of funds to the deciding authorities added legitimacy to Utah's bid.

Councilor Shannon Ellsworth expressed her support for this committee and what they are hoping to accomplish by bringing the Olympics to Utah. She was curious whether this was the only

allocation that was made, or whether there would be expectations about future allocations from the City. Mr. Bullock indicated that if these improvements were made, Provo would be set for the Olympic Games. *Presentation only.*

7. A presentation regarding the allocation of Recreation, Arts, and Parks (RAP) tax funds. (21-091) ([3:40:19](#))

Doug Robins, Parks and Recreation Assistant Director, presented. Mr. Robins presented information regarding the Recreation, Arts, and Parks (RAP) Tax program. Provo's RAP tax originated from recommendations in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan process, as well as community interest. A second source of capital was to collect parks and recreation impact fees. Mr. Robins shared images of some of the park amenities which needed updates or refurbishment. In 2015, there was a ballot initiative to implement a sales tax. The tax is 1/10 of 1%, or one cent per \$10 of all taxable purchases in Provo. Mr. Robins referred to a chart showing project expenditures. For the first few years, they simply accumulated RAP tax funds; after enough funds had been accrued, they did significant parks projects on a pay-as-you-go basis. Mr. Robins reviewed the specifics of several past projects, including Rotary Park pickleball courts and Provo River Trail improvements, and highlighted their future plans as to how they would like to use this and other funding sources in the coming years to fund additional projects. Mr. Robins invited questions and comments from the Council.

Councilor David Harding thanked Mr. Robins for the excellent presentation and for being good stewards of the RAP Tax funds. Mr. Harding asked what "The Show" referred to in the list of projects. Mr. Robins indicated that this was their moniker for the Little League facility at Fort Utah Park to create a sense of place. Mr. Harding asked about the timeframe for the renovations for the north portion of the Provo River Trail or whether it would be deferred. Mr. Robins indicated that the 2230 North extension beneath the bridge over the Provo River and moving north was scheduled to begin in the fall in order to utilize MAG funding. Mr. Robins confirmed that this was expected to happen within the current RAP authorization.

Councilor Bill Fillmore thanked Parks and Recreation leadership for how much they can do with the budgets they are given. He thanked them for their great work and expressed the Council's support in the future of their initiatives. *Presentation only.*

Closed Meeting

The Municipal Council or the Governing Board of the Redevelopment Agency will consider a motion to close the meeting for the purposes of holding a strategy session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation, and/or to discuss the purchase, sale, exchange, or lease of real property, and/or the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual in conformance with 52-4-204 and 52-4-205 et. seq., Utah Code.

Motion: Bill Fillmore moved to close the meeting. Seconded by David Shipley.

Vote: Approved 5:0, with Travis Hoban and George Handley excused.

Adjournment