



MEETING MINUTES

DATE	2021-03-25	PROJECT	The Point Framework MP
TIME	10:00 AM MTN	PROJECT #	220603
LOCATION	Zoom	SUBJECT	Infrastructure & Land Use Working Group Meeting
PREPARED BY	Leah Jaramillo	MEETING #	Milestone III

ATTENDEES

Client Alan Matheson; Steve Kellenberg, Muriel Xochimitl, Colton Stock

Working Group Members Grant Crowell, Ross Dinsdale, Reid Ewing, Grant Farnsworth, Andrew Gruber, Laura Hanson, Ted Knowlton, Eric Rasband, Jim Russell, George Shaw, Soren Simonsen, Hugh Van Wagenen, Shawn Seager

SOM Team Ryan Hales, Alex Hanson, Jeremy Harbaugh, Joseph Iacobucci, Leah Jaramillo, Peter Kindel, Aaron May, Coury Morris

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.	Q&A/Comments - <ul style="list-style-type: none">populations for each concept? Early concepts would be #1 14,000-ish, #2-3 11,500-ish. Jobs - 31-36,000 roughlyAcreage - 608 total, less the canal, power - net developable is 590 acresIs there a Frontrunner station? SOM has looked at it, concept 1 includes potential linkage if a station is implemented in the future. It is very close (1.25 miles) to the Draper station and so that is not planned at this time, but the design does not preclude it.	



- Ted suggests the outcome of this process may drive that decision.
- Why do the 3 scenarios have the same FAR?
 - We wanted to limit the variables in stage 2. The market research is showing that 1FAR is the limit of the market. Stage 3 will test FAR variations.
- Are the functions as separate (Euclidian) as they look? The intent was to simplify the block uses for this stage, but it will become much more mixed in the next phase. This is assumed.
- Reed is very skeptical about auto-free zones. They seem to work well in Europe, but America is so auto-related. Wonder if we can have a lively town center with cars, like Steve did at Rancho Santa Margarita.
 - This is not specifically a retail area. The target market research shows that less auto dominant space is popular to provide more "campus" like environments. We're proceeding cautiously to avoid retail impacts from auto-free zones.
 - This could be a car-reduced space, or partially car limited space.
- In Lehi there is a lot of high density housing development. They are hearing how hard it is to build retail right now because so many things can be done online. It seems like the options with less residential and more commercial/other space makes it harder to work better. Maybe they can work, but then more people might be coming from out of area and then it increases traffic which we know is a major complaint.
 - Steve responded that these are purposefully designed to target those specific gaps or needs.

CHAT -

- Ted -city creek center is already sort of a 20 acre auto free zone (due to the big blocks).
- Soren - I agree with Ted Knowlton. As part of the original design team for the FrontRunner line, and with 15 years using transit as a primary mode of transportation, I think it would be short-sighted NOT to design for a future FrontRunner station when it makes sense to add one. Each transit transfer is a disincentive to use transit. This development has far more TOD potential than just about any existing station area on the FrontRunner line. Most of the FrontRunner areas are still primarily auto-oriented developments, including the one just to the north in Draper, and the one to the south in Lehi, and this district has the potential to be a real TOD like downtown SLC (which has 2 FrontRunner stations).



- George - Not sure Concepts 2 and 3 can work properly without a stop....
- Ted - no great downtown has its primary objective to minimize its attractiveness to areas outside if it.
- Laura Hanson - I don't think that any of these scenarios preclude a future FrontRunner station. There is a balance between travel time and access. More stations = slower travel for those traveling through this site. A transfer can work very well as long as you have high frequency. The UVX BRT and FrontRunner at the Provo and Orem stations are a great example. Walking off of one vehicle right onto another is much less of a disincentive as you'd think.
- Soren - Thanks Alan. I'll put my questions here and hope it might fit in later. I'm curious what the connections beyond The Point development might look like. First, is there movement by Draper particularly (and to a lesser extent Bluffdale) to continue the network of streets and intersection density to make this less of an "island" of development, and more of a cohesive center of a well connected community more broadly? Second, what does the "greenway" connection to the foothills and Jordan River parkway look like?

3. Pete presented the Evaluation Categories and Preliminary Recommendations

4. Transportation Q&A/Comments:

- 600 W/Porter Rockwell - UDOT analysis shows AADT of 40,000+ which means 3 lanes in each direction. This will create a major barrier in the middle of the development. It doesn't feel like a safe location for a school. The BRT or other items should have some multi-modal and a more connected grid. Getting people to and from the site is going to create some challenges.
 - What methodology was used for transportation calculations - It was the EPA model
 - The impact of the arterial has been discussed. Some other off-site roadway connections have been discussed. One idea that is intriguing is a couplet - there is a history of varied success.
 - Couplets can be great (Reid, Ted, George, Soren). If signals are timed correctly, you can moderate speeds. Another thing to consider is traffic calming like a raised intersection. Some perceptions in Utah might be the 500 S/600 S which are not hospitable to pedestrians, but Daybreak is using it successfully. Soren added in the CHAT "the 400/500/600 South



couplet and HOV connections to downtown SLC has served traffic needs well without becoming a burden from a traffic standpoint.”

- There will be more iterations in the next stage so we can look at testing that idea. SOM is concerned about the design of it for pedestrians and creating a deadzone between the two streets. It can extend trips with out of direction travel.
- UDOT - Grant - It would be interesting to know the peak travel balance to better understand the direction of travel. Also, there are one-way frontage roads along I-15 planned in the 2040s.
- There will be a document forthcoming on transportation. There is some info in submittal 2 that can be shared.

5. Other Q&A/Comments on Evaluation Categories and Preliminary Recommendations

- Were transit ridership differences looked at? Yes, the model examines probability of ridership, but that will be looked at more extensively in the next stages.
- There are differences in the options, but the concepts are fairly close.
 - The intention was that the three were programmatically distinct. But, they seem to have blended. Concept 1 was closest to a balance but with higher jobs per the legislative mandate. 2 was meant to be much more loaded with retail, entertainment and cultural amenities to test the regional need. 3 was heavily jobs-focused. It is interesting to see that they did not generate significant difference except in the traffic & open space

6. Alan asked for input on the concepts and elements that should be carried forward into the preferred alternative. He reacknowledged that the evaluation is not weighted. Steve walked through the urban form. Alan added that any of the key elements can be added

- 1 - more about districts with jobs/office closest to I-15, central district and residential on the west. Clearly defined open space delineates districts. Also the development plan is to recruit different developers for each district to specialize in their respective areas of development.
- 2 - more like the regional hub, reintegrating ecological open-space into the fabric of the area. This plan highlights the interplay with the Jordan River into the site and provides a regional strategy.



- 3 - synergy - with non-auto linkages from the cores of each surrounding area to the center. opportunity for central park with potential wow-factor with major gathering space, entertainment or water.

7. Q&A/Comments

- Ted - really likes 2 of the big concepts are the central park (3) and the big east/west green vein connection from either concepts 1 or 2
- Soren - there has been some thoughtful element to connectivity beyond the boundaries. But, how do we put less strain on the regional connectors. Does the transportation grid facilitate extension into surrounding areas Draper & Bluffdale to enhance connectivity regionally?
 - Alan agrees that this is very important. We have been having conversations with Bluffdale, Draper and adjacent land owners. We want to look at this as part of the region not a bounded parcel.
 - Soren thinks concept 2 lends itself more to a regional grid system

8. Elements of any concept that ought to be carried forward to Stage 3 preferred alternative or should not be.

- George - economic development catalyst needs to be looked at for the whole Wasatch Front before moving this concept forward. A lot of municipalities have planned similar types of development with “downtown” concepts.
- Grant Crowell- suggests that concept 2 might conflict more with local plans (as it looks more like a typical sub-urban type of plan) whereas concept 3 might be more statewide with the research/institutional hub, etc.
- Eric Rasband - More connections to the west
- Hugh - a lot of good things. echo permeability in concept 2 in terms of intersections and nodes. Dealing with car traffic in & out. Transit & trail connections should really be emphasized where possible. Continue to focus on how to get people to the site.
- Ted - this is in the I-15, FrontRunner corridor. Congestion is not going away. It doesn't really matter what happens on this site, but to try to avoid congestion is maybe not the driver. The question is how much can people get to where they need to go *if it is congested* by transit? This speaks to the regional question we've talked about. If there are more regional destinations that are close to transit. These should be married. There



is a downside to organizing them on I-15 as it already has so many. There is so much latent demand on I-15. Can we look more at connectivity to destinations by other modes in this area.

9. KVEs & Discussion

- Soren - Opening connectivity east/west and across the Point region- could frontrunner go underground for a few miles? BRT would connect vertically. Most of the Frontrunner stations now are park & ride. Whereas this statewide center of commerce might need a transit system designed to meet the needs of a regional destination. This might be part of long-term future expansion or accommodation plans, not necessarily the early stages.
- Eric Rasband - to maintain the functionality of the frontrunner stations - would it make sense to close/reorganize some of the existing station locations in order to maintain the travel time, reliability, etc. This could be a very difficult conversation
- Steve - It seems like the lack of a frontrunner station could have both short and long term impact on the project. Alan said this is the direction UTA is moving, but the conversation can happen.
- Hugh - Thinking about pedestrian priority and car-free zones. Big fan of these, but if it is not feasible - the car has to find the right place in the space. Hugh wanted to emphasize the initiative that the first priority is provided to pedestrians in the entire master plan. This should move forward.
- Ross Dinsdale - Pedestrian corridors and multi-modal transportation can probably be incorporated into any of the scenarios we've looked at.
- Grant Farnsworth - We want to keep forward compatibility in our design
- Grant Farnsworth -Need to optimize capacity, look at parking combinations to reduce limits and share the need at multiple facilities.
- George Shaw - on mixed-use, would like to see further description of the mixed use between the 3 scenarios. Also reference to 3-level retail - would like to learn how that might affect other factors in the plan.

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