

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
October 17, 2017

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Kent Bush	Councilmember
	Nike Peterson	Councilmember
	Vern Phipps	Councilmember
	Tim Roper	Councilmember
	Bruce Young	Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	Adam Lenhard	City Manager
	JJ Allen	Assistant City Manager
	Brie Brass	Assistant City Attorney
	Scott Hodge	Public Works Director
	Greg Krusi	Police Chief
	Eric Howes	Community Services Director
	Spencer Brimley	Development Services Manager
	Rich Knapp	Finance Manager
	Trevor Cahoon	Communications Coordinator
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder
	Wendy Page	Deputy Recorder
EXCUSED:	Stuart Williams	City Attorney

VISITORS: Robert Stotts, Brady Jugler – Planning Commission Chair, Paul Drake – Utah Transit Authority (UTA)

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE 18-INCH WATERLINE UNDER SR-193 PROJECT LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1675 EAST SR-193 (700 SOUTH)

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, stated the City recently requested bids for an 18-inch waterline project located at approximately 1675 East SR-193. He noted before the area was further developed it would be advantageous to replace the existing 16-inch waterline. He explained the current 16-inch waterline ran east of the Sundown Condominiums and was a transit waterline made of concrete which has asbestos fibers in it. He continued the City was attempting to phase out those types of lines eliminating the special testing for asbestos.

Councilmember Peterson indicated the staff report mentioned capping the 16-inch waterline for future use and wondered how often the City might return to use a line with asbestos that it was trying to phase out. Mr. Hodge responded if the line was capped and left in place at some point in the future it could be used as a storm drain line. He continued the Utah Department of

Transportation (UDOT) requested the 16-inch line be filled with material; however, because the City could use the line as a future storm drain it would be abandoned and capped.

Mr. Hodge stated the City installed a section of 18-inch waterline prior to development of the AAA parking lot about two years ago. He continued the 18-inch waterline had not yet been used but was in place and the current project included connecting the two lines. He reviewed the project details with the Council.

Councilmember Bush asked if the new 18-inch waterline would be parallel to the 16-inch line and the same depth. Mr. Hodge answered it would run parallel on the east side of the 16-inch line; however, the lines would likely not be the same depth. Councilmember Bush wondered if the waterline north of 700 South would be replaced also. Mr. Hodge responded the north waterline would not be replaced yet.

Mr. Hodge stated six bids were received for the 18-inch waterline project. He noted Nix Construction was the low bidder with a bid of \$295,038. He continued with consideration for contingency and engineering costs estimated to be \$74,962, the total project cost would be \$370,000. He explained it was anticipated work would be done during the late winter or early spring of 2018.

Councilmember Phipps questioned if the City had worked with the contractor before. Mr. Hodge explained had previously worked with Nix Construction on projects requiring boring in the City. Councilmember Phipps remarked it was always surprising to see the wide range of pricing in the bid results.

Mr. Hodge asked if there were any further questions. Mayor Shepherd hearing no further discussion thanked Mr. Hodge and asked if this item would be on the agenda soon. Mr. Hodge responded the request could be addressed at the next policy session on October 24, 2017.

DISCUSSION ON THE SANDRIDGE APARTMENTS SUBDIVISION – FIRST AMENDED PLAT (CITY CENTRE APARTMENTS) LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 70 SOUTH STATE STREET

Spencer Brimley, Development Services Manager, stated the City received a request from Jared Nelson with Highmark Construction for the project more commonly known and City Centre to amend the previously named plat, Sandridge Apartments Subdivision. He explained that Highmark Construction discovered a large amount of utility lines running along State Street. He noted Highmark Construction desired to have the commercial development space on the north end of the property; however, the City would need to remove the utility easement on the north side of the lot in order for construction of the commercial space to meet the required square footage stipulated in the Development Agreement. Mr. Brimley stated Public Works and the City Engineer were consulted and no utilities were found on the north end, so it would not be a potential problem to remove the utility easement. He indicated that removing a utility easement required consideration by the Council. He stated the Planning Commission reviewed and recommended approval of the Sandridge Apartments Subdivision – First Amended Plat.

Councilmember Phipps asked why the easement was in that location. Mr. Brimley responded the City typically required a ten foot easement around the property and it was left open for potential utilities and to create separation from the street and the property. He explained when the contractor requested the additional space for the necessary retail space, staff investigated and finding no utilities in the area determined removing the easement would allow the necessary square footage for the commercial space.

Councilmember Bush wondered if construction would come to the property line or if there was enough room to keep a five foot easement in place. Mr. Brimley answered the construction would come all the way to the property line and was consistent with discussions about the evolving form based code. He added the amendment would allow for the 4,500 square feet of commercial space consistent with the requirement of the Development Agreement. Mayor Shepherd remarked the plat amendment would allow the contractor to accomplish what the City required to be done with the area.

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, suggested the parking area on the west side of the property was taking shape and could be visited.

UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY (UTA) PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1250 SOUTH STATE STREET, COMMONLY KNOWN AS CLEARFIELD STATION

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, noted Stadler Rail was no longer interested in developing at the Clearfield Station site; but rather, had ground breaking at its selected site in Salt Lake City. He explained the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) property development area consisted of 70 acres. He reminded the Council that 10 of the 70 acres were being developed by Thackeray Garn with a project known as the Clearfield Station Apartments. Mr. Allen indicated the remaining 60 acres were again an open slate. He stated UTA's new model under the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) guidelines would be to partner with the community to plan for the development of the property. He introduced Paul Drake, UTA Senior Manager Real Estate for TOD, and welcomed his input with the discussion. Mr. Allen recapped the staff report which introduced the idea of developing a Station Area Plan. There was a discussion which considered the following questions: 1) Should the City commence in partnership with UTA to create a Station Area Plan or seek for developers interested in the property? 2) Should the City wait for the next grant cycle to seek funding for the creation of a Station Area Plan which would typically be a longer process with Wasatch Front Regional Council? 3) Should the City proceed promptly without grant funding to create a Station Area Plan at an increased expense but would be completed while the economy was flourishing?

Mr. Allen mentioned UTA staff expressed interest in beginning the process of partnering to create the Station Area Plan. He stated drafting a scope and the request for proposal (RFP) had already begun should the Council decide to move forward with the process.

Councilmember Roper asked if the Station Area Plan process would be similar to the Small Area Plan process and if form based code would be used. Mr. Allen answered there had not yet been a discussion about using form based code in the Station Area Plan but it could be considered.

Councilmember Bush expressed his opinion the property had been vacant long enough and he did not want to wait for grant funding before proceeding with a Station Area Plan. There was a discussion about whether or not to proceed with the Station Area Plan process including the following key points:

- A Station Area Plan could be helpful when meeting with interested developers while the market was still favorable.
- Waiting for grant funding to develop the Station Area Plan did not seem prudent.
- Finding one developer for the entire 60 acres was not likely so having some kind of plan would be helpful when meeting with multiple developers.
- Engaging with developers needed to be an important part of the process because that was where the funding would come from for the development.
- Form based code was discussed as an option and possibility for the Station Area Plan.
- Concerns were voiced about selling off acres of land or adding additional housing prior to having a plan for the area as a whole.
- Involving developers in the process would help create a Station Area Plan for something feasible and realistic.
- Visibility and freeway access to Clearfield Station had previously been a concern for developers and could dictate which development was drawn to the area.
- Market analysis, number crunching, and community involvement were desired components for the planning process of the Station Area Plan.
- If a Station Area Plan was drafted it should include the current density of the surrounding area. Mr. Allen noted TOD guidelines included a half mile radius towards density.

Mr. Allen recapped the Station Area planning process would begin with a market analysis. He stated Mayor Shepherd had suggested accelerating the planning process by basing the plan off of what developers were ready to build while the market was favorable. Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion the vision should come from the community prior to meeting with developers so the City had a say in what was developed without giving the developers free reign. Mr. Drake commented UTA's planning process of creating a Station Area Plan initially involved defining the City's and UTA's vision of a mixed use rail station that would follow TOD guidelines. He continued developers would then be asked to provide reality for that vision with those components which were feasible and realistic for the area.

Councilmember Bush suggested several of the surrounding areas should be included in a Station Area plan rather than only the 60 acres of land at the station. Mr. Allen responded UTA and City staffs held a meeting and part of the discussion was to review surrounding parcels and consider which if any should be included as part of the Station Area Plan. Councilmember Bush wondered if those outlying properties would be notified and involved in the process. Mr. Allen said involving property owners should be part of the planning process.

Councilmember Phipps asked if affordable housing was a necessary component of the plan. Mr. Allen answered the topic of affordable housing was also discussed during the meeting with City and UTA staffs previously. He stated the City could show clear data that half of the community was already affordable housing. Councilmember Bush questioned if the housing being built by Thackeray Garn was considered affordable housing. Mr. Allen responded it was market rate housing; however, many other apartments in the area were considered affordable housing. Mr.

Drake mentioned State Statute required UTA to provide provisions for affordable housing in its TOD guidelines policy. He stated every city was also required to have a master plan with affordable housing provisions; therefore, UTA opted to defer to the City's plans. Mr. Drake confirmed the City would meet the affordable housing requirement. He concluded another purpose of looking at a broader area for the Station Area Plan would be to allow better access to the station not only for automobiles but also those pedestrians and cyclists using the trails.

Mr. Allen stated he was hearing general consensus to move forward with the Station Area planning process in partnership with UTA. He stated the City and UTA had not yet discussed the possibility of negotiating an Interlocal Agreement specific to the development of the Station Area Plan. Mr. Drake stated UTA staff had discussed it and thought it could be done without an Interlocal Agreement. Mr. Allen indicated a streamlined process would be helpful and the Station Area Plan cost sharing would be a fifty-fifty split between UTA and the City. He did not know the exact cost; however, estimated it would be approximately \$50,000 to \$75,000.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the intent was to have a consultant be engaged with the planning process. Mr. Allen responded contracting with a consultant would be necessary.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the estimated costs were just the City's portion or a total project cost. Mr. Allen explained it was an estimated total project cost and the City would share 50 percent of those costs.

Councilmember Bush asked if a request for proposal (RFP) would be prepared. Mr. Allen answered yes. He requested feedback from the Council on how much public engagement was desired with the process. There was a discussion about receiving public input, having perimeters as was the case with the Small Area Plan, educating the public when the market analysis was complete, and allowing participation from the public so there was a better understanding of the project.

Mr. Allen identified the process and engagement with the public was the desire of the Council and critical for development at Clearfield Station. He acknowledged time was of the essence so the City would move forward with UTA not sacrificing any of the critical components of engagement during the Station Area planning process. He stated the drafted copies of the scope of work and RFP would be given to UTA staff by end of day on October 18, 2017. He suggested once the scope and RFP were released then reviews of the RFP, market analysis, and the planning process could begin.

Councilmember Peterson reiterated what had been discussed previously about the City having standards even if general in nature and setting the bar high when approaching developers about the Clearfield Station area. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, reminded the TOD guidelines included a mixture of uses and high quality expectations. He requested the guidelines be redistributed to the Council for review. Councilmember Bush recalled the TOD guidelines seemed consistent with zoning. Mr. Allen stated the TOD guidelines would be redistributed and were very similar to what the City envisioned for the property all along.

Councilmember Bush moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in CDRA work session at 6:49 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper, and Young. Voting NO – None.

The minutes for the CDRA are in a separate location

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 14th day of November, 2017**

/s/Mark R. Shepherd, Mayor

ATTEST:

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Clearfield City Council meeting held Tuesday, October 17, 2017.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder