



## MEETING MINUTES

DATE	2021-03-25	PROJECT	The Point Framework MP
TIME	2:00 PM MTN	PROJECT #	220603
LOCATION	Zoom	SUBJECT	Economic Development, Recruitment & Investment Working Group Meeting
PREPARED BY	Leah Jaramillo	MEETING #	Milestone III

### ATTENDEES

**Client** Alan Matheson; Steve Kellenberg, Erin Talkington, Muriel Xochimitl, Colton Stock

**Working Group Members** Lloyd Allen, William Benz, Dave Carlebach, April Cooper, Jay Francis, Daniel Hemmert, Stan Lockhart, Jeffery Nelson, Thor Roundy, Michael Stewart, Mark Welcker

**SOM Team** Peter Kindel, Aaron May, Leah Jaramillo

These notes record the discussions and reflect the current status of the project. If you have any comments or corrections, please notify SOM in writing within 10 days.

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
------	---------	--------

1. SOM presented progress presentation on the Master Plan Framework to date Q&A/Comments on COncepts
  - Daniel Hemmert mentioned the Governor's 500 day plan includes an innovation incubator at the Point. Alan confirmed that this concept is in support of this initiative and it is a given in any of these concepts. He said the executive branch will be pushing this as a top 10 priority for use of \$1.4 M stimulus money with the legislature. Alan would like to continue discussions on this. There will be some infrastructure needs to make the project work. This could certainly be done within the 2024 timeframe. Daniel agrees this could be a high, best use.
  - Jeffery Nelson - Like the economic focus in concept 3, trail in concept 2. William Benz echoed this.



- i. Pete explained that features can be picked from either concept, they are not wholly exclusive.
- What is a car-free zone?
  - i. Identifying portions of the project where a car is not fully excluded, but is in a secondary position to people, bicycles, pedestrians. It is really a “pedestrian forward” district. Vehicles would not be prohibited for EMS, etc. What are ways we can limit automobiles to benefit pedestrians and to create differentiation in the urban pattern.
- Lloyd Allen - suspect that most preference will be for concept 3 asked to see the BRT route layout in concept 3
- Thor Roundy - housing is needed to make these concepts vibrant. The danger with concept 3 is that, unless there is significant housing density off-site or adjacent, it might lack vibrancy after work hours and therefore impact the kind of walkability, retail, etc.
  - i. Steve asked if it is the amount of housing or the intermixing of both driving the comment? Thor mentioned that it would require more focus on how to keep people in the site if they don't live there, or how to attract more people in the off-hours.
  - ii. Need to look at the human being in the space
- Jay Francis asked for a scale comparison.
  - i. Alan said it is similar to the downtown Salt Lake area from South Temple - 800 South 700 E-300 W
- Lloyd Allen - likes the idea of a park or sports complex but wondered what the municipal comments were and whether there is a need for this type of green space.
  - i. Pete explained that the public has expressed the desire for a lot of open space. The municipalities have concern about maintenance costs, loss of tax revenue, etc. Early conversations with SL County have indicated some potential, but this is in process.
  - ii. We know that the people that live and work within these types of communities put a high value on walkable amenities of these types which supports the rationale for extra parks



- iii. Jay suggests there are some potential economic opportunities for something like this. There are lucrative economics tied to these types of events. They can become drivers there.

## 2. Pete walked through the Evaluation and Recommendations

### Q&A/Comments

- Jeffrey Nelson - auto-free zones. It is interesting that concept 3 wins based on acreage, but there is something to be said for the concentrated benefit of plan 2's car-free zone. It may work out better in concept 2, and he likes 2 more throughout the presentation of the evaluation section. rather than being disparate like in concept 3.
  - more work to come in the next iteration to clarify the pedestrian priority/car-free delineation
- Lloyd expected the jobs/housing balances to be more different across the concepts. There is slightly less land area to housing in concept 3, but the types are higher density, so the number comes out about the same.
- April asked if there were any economic development/recruitment ideas
  - Jeffery Nelson - site 3 feels less differentiated, concept 2 has some distinctiveness with the trail throughway and retail that could be accomplished there. That emphasizes and capitalizes on the natural environment in Utah.
  - April - want to make that people who don't live in the area have a reason to come down and enjoy. Alan added that we are reaching out to recruiters to ask these types of questions to developers to ensure we are getting that kind of input in design.
- William Benz- would like to see how the experts would come up with the best items from concepts 2 & 3. Specifically the central park and having it be auto-free or auto-minimal, accessibility of the regional hub in concept 2.
- David Carlebach - more entertainment or dining be along the river like Riverwalk in San Antonio would be an attractive feature.
  - one idea we've been looking at with concept 2 is connecting the river with the east/west green connection. The river is actually about .25 miles from the site. But we are suggesting that there is a way to capture onsite



water to create a secondary water component that could be connected to the central park.

### 3. Pete presented the KVEs - Initiatives

- Lloyd Allen - Thinking about anchor companies. Thinking about a company that is going to be funding that type of development. How do we get their interest addressed. It isn't easy to bring companies in when they could go to Lehi for lower cost. Getting early buy-in and state funding will be critical.
  - Solutions - thinking about western US or National companies. Let the state know that they might choose a 5-story building in Lehi right now instead of the extra cost at the Point and so there may be funds needed to encourage this.
- David Carlebach - don't see any mention of public art spaces on the KVEs. Is this a principle that might help attract talent and even anchor tenants. Alan agrees that this is important to recruiting interest.
- Is it desirable to have a single company take a larger presence, or more companies at smaller number of parcels, or does it not matter?
  - Previously, it had a lot of characteristics for one large tenant like Amazon, but there aren't very many of those. Trying to bank on one-mega company is a long shot. The Lehi model seems more realistic
  - Thor - really like the idea of creating districts and that gives a great opportunity to brand on the verticals. To create a number of really interesting angles to attract a number of businesses across the site.
- William Benz - Attract outstanding talent and investment will be critical. Need the workforce in place to start companies and keep them here, that will be critical. This project should establish that.
- Lloyd Allen - what is the latest thinking on this being a cost-neutral or revenue generating opportunity. We want to avoid this needing an on-going funding need. Would like a lot of attention to this with a return instead of ongoing cost. Alan agrees - our team is looking at the market, regional strengths, partnerships with the private sector and as a business to ensure it can stay viable over the long term. This is in progress and is critical to our success. We want this to provide returns to the state, although it may need some initial investment.
- CHAT - Jeffery Nelson "Big fan of "culture of creativity and ingenuity". Seems this would



serve the purpose of attracting outside talent. Could be a combination of life science and tech, but a place for innovation and ingenuity to thrive.”

4. Alan explained the process next steps, thanked the Working Group members and closed the meeting.