



MEETING MINUTES

| | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|---|
| DATE | 2021-03-23 | PROJECT | The Point Framework MP |
| TIME | 2:00 PM MTN | PROJECT # | 220603 |
| LOCATION | Zoom | SUBJECT | Working Group Meeting: Education, Research & Innovation |
| PREPARED BY | Aaron May | MEETING # | |

ATTENDEES

Client Alan Matheson; Steve Kellenberg; Muriel Xochimiltl;

Working Group Members Brenner Adams; Jonathon Bates; Kelyvn Cullimore; Willard Dere; Stephen Handy; Chris Klomp; Nathan Lee; Keith Marmer; Donna Milakovi; Dave Woolstenhulme

SOM Peter Kindel, Aaron May

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 | |
| 2. | Questions/Comments from stakeholder group: | |
| | a. Brenner Adams: Suggestion for a bike and skateboarding park in park programming; pickleball. | |
| | b. Kelyvn Cullimore: Massing of the residential with higher density housing and multifamily units. | |
| | c. Nathan Lee: How much has been provided to the Xeriscape and Water dependency issues? | |
| | d. Chris Klomp: Strong reactions to each. Option 3 feels like more of the same, we have something like this in Lehi, The U, and elsewhere. Concept 2 is a bit of a mix of 1 and 3, option 1 would lead to “unplanned collisions” and has a very unique offering with nothing like this in Utah. How do communities decide in which direction to go? Concept 1 bleeding into concept 2 is preferred. | |
| | e. Brenner Adams: Central pathway in Regional Hub option is very interesting and connects river to ridge, but the Central Park and higher density of Economic Catalyst are very differentiating, like that look and feel. | |
| | f. Kelyvn Cullimore: Because the land is owned by the state we have We need to have intentionally planned open space to meet residential and commercial needs. Would like to see more of that even if that means more density and taller buildings. Create more open space and walkability. | |
| | g. William Dere: Is there an example of the complete community similar to the Concept 1? What are 1 or 2 of the critical success factors for that example; a merger of schemes 2 and 3. SOM Response: Presence of an institutional partner seems to be a consistent element of an innovation district. A physical differentiation of the environment is very critical to support tech and other industries that want to be unique and different. | |



- h. Jonathan Bates: Completely agree with Kelvyn's point of intentionally planned, activated/programmed green space corridors. Love the Central Park and connected green space corridors in Concept 3. As well as the added opportunities for density. Density will be important for activation and the intentional/unintentional collisions/collaborations. Very impressed overall with the work and concepts coming out of this process.
- i. Kelvyn Cullimore: To make this area unique we need to provide elements that are NOT available in the surrounding communities. Like Brenner said, we don't really need soccer fields if there are soccer fields in the area. Similarly entertainment areas and retail need to be planned with regional amenities in mind balanced with what the residents local to the project may require - or what is needed to support the business functions in the area.
- j. Brenner Adams: Seems like Concept 1 feels like Zurich, Concept 2 feels like the banks in Seoul, and Concept 3 feels like Munich south ring(Ostpark).
- k. Donna Milakovic: How much does it change Concept #2 if the sports complex isn't a lot of soccer fields? Is there another use that would retain the open/green space? And still be an innovative and value add in the Region?
- l. Keith Marmer: On concept 3 with higher ed anchor and a K-12 school creates a very interesting workforce development opportunity. Families would have opportunity for schools with hands-on opportunities would be very unique and would support both community focus and industry focus.
- m. Steppen Handy: Geothermal assets and Joe Moore at the University of Utah is running a demonstration site, could be used as an analogue project. There are some geothermal site assets that are involved in heating the current prison, to be further evaluated.
- n. Kelvyn Cullimore: Density may be the answer that everyone is looking for to allow for more uses and still accommodate more open space on the project. As we get to more specific planning, it is important for the board to hold the line on the vision for the project.
- o. Brenner Adams: Large thoroughfare connecting to the Jordan River trail is strongly recommended to take advantage of this regional asset. Support for Concept 2 as the framework for development to be further advanced with best elements of 1 and 3.
- p. Donna Milakovic: Attracting outside talent and innovation and means this must not look like everything else. Lowering barriers and increasing cultural diversity will be important.
- q. Nathan Lee: The brand and marketing of the area may be is something that should be addressed in the Innovation KVE.
- r. Brenner Adams: Incentives for businesses to form alliances.
- s. Nathan Lee: Heavy winters should be considered. Should there be consideration of 2nd level connections?
- t. Kelvyn Cullimore: To support bio-tech, we may need a boutique hospital to be used as a research institution and support the local residents.
- u. Donna Milakovic: Political Pressure should not lead to over-prescribe the innovation character and lock out other potential opportunities. What we have available now, and what can be built on the future will be important.

****Meeting concluded