MINUTES OF A VINEYARD
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD MEETING
City Council Chambers
125 South Main Street, Vineyard, Utah
September 11, 2019 at 7:12 PM

Present	**Absent**
Chair Julie Fullmer	
Boardmember John Earnest	
Boardmember Tyce Flake	
Boardmember Chris Judd	
Boardmember Nate Riley	

Staff Present: City Manager/Finance Director Jacob McHargue, Assistant City Engineer Chris Wilson, City Attorney David Church, Community Development Director Morgan Brim, City Planner Elizabeth Hart, City Recorder Pamela Spencer, Building Official George Reid, Water/Parks Manager Sullivan Love, Planning Commissioners Bryce Brady, Jessica Welch, and Tay Gudmundson

Others Speaking: Pete Evans with Anderson Geneva and Flagship Homes

7:12 PM REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD MEETING

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Fullmer opened the RDA meeting at 7:12 PM.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

2.1. Approval of the August 14, 2019 RDA Meeting Minutes

Chair Fullmer called for a motion.

Motion: BOARDMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT ITEM 2.1. BOARDMEMBER FLAKE SECONDED THE MOTION. CHAIR FULLMER, BOARDMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. BUSINESS ITEMS

3.1 DISCUSSION – Town Center

Flagship Homes is requesting a discussion about the Town Center plan and a Development Agreement. No action will be taken at this time.

Chair Fullmer turned the time over to Pete Evans with Flagship Homes.

Mr. Evans explained that with the purchase of the Geneva property, they also purchased the Anderson Geneva name. He said that the proposed zoning was almost identical to the original Town Center Form-based Zoning Code. He mentioned that they made a few changes to the design. He explained that some of the changes were moving all of the Geneva Park to the east side of Main Street and to move some of the Village Office area to the west side of Main Street. He said that the rest of the zoning was consistent with the original code. He explained that zoning was broken into three different areas:

- The Town Center Station Zone near the FrontRunner
- The Town Center Mixed-Use Zone to the west of the station zone
- The Village Office Zone to the north
- The Lake Oriented Mixed-Use Zone to the west, against Utah Lake.

Mr. Evans explained that they had hired KTGY Architecture and Planning (KTGY) to help lay out the land plan and the map. He mentioned that KTGY had done a lot of transit-oriented communities throughout the country. He felt that they had come up with a plan that circulated well, accomplished the goals of highlighting the train station and getting the mix of commercial, retail, office, and residential space that they had envisioned for the property.

Mr. Evans mentioned that in the Village Office area there was a 1-acre park space designated as the Plaza Park. He felt that it did not make sense to include that park space in this area once they had consolidated the Geneva Park. He added that they would make up that park space in an area that made more sense.

Boardmember Flake asked what their vision was for the lake front area north of where the Edge Homes development was going in. Mr. Evans replied that their vision would become more apparent as they built out the other areas. He felt that that area could have some cool programming. He mentioned that there were parties interested in that land, but felt that it would not be the best use once the Town Center was built.

Chair Fullmer asked if Anderson Geneva was asking for feedback or guidance. Mr. Evans replied yes. He felt that the plan was for backbone infrastructure. He explained that each block would be divided into smaller planning areas with mixes of uses. He said that they had asked KTGY to use best practices and walkability when designing the area. He said that smaller block sizes dispersed the vehicular traffic and encouraged walkability. He added that they wanted to create a magnet destination. He gave an example of Ogden getting rid of buildings and felt that Vineyard had a head start, with a blank slate, to create something different and useable. Their vision for Vineyard was people coming to visit the amenities.

Boardmember Riley felt that it was really important to the board that someone in Salt Lake would be able to come down on a Saturday and find the lake and enjoy the Town Center amenities. Mr. Evans said that based on conversations they had the Utah Lake Commission and the Utah County Commission members were committed to reclaiming Utah Lake as an amenity for the people of Utah County.

Boardmember Earnest asked if there would be plenty of parking in the area. Mr. Evans replied that their goal was to have most of the FrontRunner Station populated by the people who live in the area. He said that there was adequate parking planned along the Lake Promenade and the retail outlets. He mentioned that they had not programmed the west end near the lake.

Boardmember Riley asked where they were at with Utah Valley University's (UVU) involvement. Chair Fullmer replied that UVU had been sitting on the committee for the FrontRunner station. She said that UVU was looking at trying to get a building started on their site. She added that they were also in discussions about purchasing more land, student housing, an innovations business research campus, etc. She felt that the movement in Vineyard had gotten UVU excited about moving forward. Mr. Evans said that they had met with UVU about purchasing additional land and seeing positive movement on their land. Boardmember Judd felt that it would be great to have UVU as a partner. There was a discussion about UVU as a partner.

Boardmember Flake expressed concern with traffic flow from the turnoff into the FrontRunner station and the integration of the bus routes. Mr. Evans replied that they had incorporated sawtooth designs on the east side of the FrontRunner street. He mentioned that they had been working with the traffic engineers and UTA and they felt that the plan worked for them. He added that it would be a one-way street going into the station.

Boardmember Judd asked about the development agreement. Mr. Evans replied that their goal was to have a plan that they were confident in before they came to the board with a development agreement. He said that the proposal for the development agreement would be to be reimbursed by the RDA for the infrastructure and structured parking.

Chair Fullmer felt that the most productive way was for the board to give Anderson Geneva feedback on the infrastructure and how much money they were willing to contribute.

Mr. Brim explained that the Town Center Zoning Code anticipated that there would be some changes once they started developing the land. He felt that the changes to the park mentioned by Mr. Evans were a better design and added that it would involve changing that subdistrict in the code. He said that the Town Center Zoning Code was the foundational document and if the board felt that the proposed design would make it even better, then they could use the development agreement to supersede parts of the code.

Mr. Evans explained that this was not the most cost-efficient plan to build but they wanted to have a walkable community. He said that internally, there would be a lot of buildings, roads, alleys, open space, plazas, etc., to make it livable and walkable, and to make it a downtown mixed-use environment. Mr. Church said that the developers' anticipation was that the RDA Board would be approving reimbursement of the backbone infrastructure. Chair Fullmer added that parking would be part of the infrastructure discussion. Mr. Church mentioned that the project improvements would not be coming to the RDA for approval. Mr. Evans added that the internal roads would be non-reimbursable costs. Mr. Church felt that it was important to get the development agreement done now before they sell the land and develop it. Mr. Evans mentioned that Anderson Geneva's plan was to build all of the site.

Boardmember Flake asked about the parking garages. Mr. Evans replied that if they did not have structured parking, then the urban development would not work. He felt that it should be shared parking between commercial and residential uses, but that would be dependent on the actual use.

Boardmember Riley expressed concern about the development agreement. He said that the board had done development agreements in the past and not gotten everything they anticipated getting. He said that there had to be a win-win with what they were getting for reimbursing the backbone infrastructure. He felt that this needed to be clear in the agreement.

Boardmember Judd agreed with Boardmember Riley. He said that he needed to see the costs with the benefits. How much would the RDA be reimbursing versus what the developer was putting in and at what point in time would the infrastructure be built. Mr. Church explained that one benefit would be that the RDA would be reimbursing only if they bring in development. He briefly reviewed the issues with the Homesteads agreement. He felt that the Anderson Geneva development would be more like the Waters Edge development. There was a discussion about the timeline. Mr. Evan said that their plan was to start development right away. Boardmember Judd felt that they needed to determine what the backbone infrastructure really was. The discussion continued.

Chair Fullmer summarized that they needed to discuss parking, backbone infrastructure, fiscal rewards, benchmarks, triggers, milestones, the agreement, sustainability, accountability and clarity, parks and designs, and the negotiations between the give-and-takes.

Boardmember Riley asked if they could see other products that KTGY had designed to compare this design to. Mr. Church mentioned that the Form-based Zoning Code was still intact and would be used. Boardmember Riley said that he would like to see a finished project. Mr. Evans said that they would be willing show the board completed examples of the templates from completed buildings in other areas. He added that a lot of the things they would have had to figure out had already been approved in the Form-based Zoning Code such as ratios, density, mixed-uses, etc.

Chair Fullmer felt the it would be good to see the smaller built designs. She said if there were any changes to the roads or exchanges for parks or density that they were adding to the agreement they should be added to the future discussions.

3.2 DISCUSSION AND ACTION – Waters Edge 3-Acre Park

The RDA Board will discuss the design and amenities of the 3-Acre park located north of the James Bay subdivision within the Waters Edge Development.

Chair Fullmer turned the time over to City Manager Jacob McHargue.

Mr. McHargue said that staff had already taken the 3-acre park (known as Sunset Beach Park) through the site plan process but some of the items did not have a funding source and that there were a couple of options. He explained that he had presented it as an RDA application with all of the items that were not included in the Waters Edge agreement. He said that Flagship Homes was willing to put the additional amenities in, if the RDA was willing to reimburse them. Mr. Church explained that this was a good example of the RDA approving a basic park, the Planning Commission wanting to put in other amenities, and the developer wanting to know who was paying for it. Boardmember Riley felt that, with how slowly things moved, it was hard to make a decision without looking back and seeing how they had missed these amenities. There was a brief discussion about the park approval. Mr. McHargue explained that the statement in the Waters Edge agreement read "…improvements envisioned for this park are a pavilion, eating areas, restrooms and parking." He said that the other things would be reimbursable if the RDA Board agreed to them. He added that the board could send it back to the Planning Commission. Mr. Church suggested that they could pay for the amenities with the Capital Improvements Fund.
Boardmember Flake expressed frustration with seeing different pictures of the park with different amenities at different meetings and then wondering what he approved. He suggested that they put a date on the acceptance and what they see on that date is what they approved. Boardmember Riley expressed the same frustrations. He added that he was disappointed with what they had approved.

He felt that they needed to figure out a way to pay for the additional amenities. Mr. Evans felt that his company should have done a better job of tracking the projects as they were being built. He said the they had combined the budgets for the 6-acre and 3-acre parks and what was put in the 6-acre park was different than what was on the approved plans. He suggested that they should have highlighted that as the budget for the 6-acre park went up, the 3-acre park's budget would go down. He said that there was a base level of improvements in each park and felt that the current plan matched the reimbursement component. He said that they presented a plan to the Planning Commission with a desire of what they wanted to see in the 3-acre park before the total costs for the 6-acre park had come in.

Chair Fullmer asked if they had talked about a bike station. Mr. Brim said that the Planning Commission had requested that it be added back in near the restrooms. He added that there would be signage added notifying bicyclists of its location. There was a discussion about the bike station.

Boardmember Flake expressed concern with the decision of how the trail continued to the Edge Homes property. He felt the trail was important and wanted to see it done. There was a discussion about how the trail would be paid for. Mr. Wilson explained that the majority of the trail was on state lands but that there was a small gap of a few hundred feet and they were looking at options. He added that there would be changes to the outfalls of the utilities to Utah Lake. Mr. McHargue stated that it would be an RDA project.

Boardmember Judd explained that they had received a lot of feedback about the large hill in the 18-acre park and wanted to know if the slide shown for the 3-acre park would present concerns with people looking into backyards. Mr. Church suggested that they avoid making the 3-acre park a destination park. There was a discussion about the slide height and orientation. Boardmember Riley felt that the park would become a destination park because of the sand and water amenities.

Boardmember Riley expressed concern about the parking. He asked if people would be allowed to park on the road. Chair Fullmer felt that during the entire planning of the city, they had planned the part as a destination place. They needed to think about the amenities and their consequences. Boardmember Judd felt that they needed additional park space that people would want to visit. Mr. Wilson added that the trail head at the 3-acre park was a main trail head for the county trail and gave access to the beach, so no matter what amenities they included, it would be a destination point. Boardmember Earnest also felt that anything along the beach would be a destination point.

Chair Fullmer called for further comments.

Boardmember Judd asked about the tiered amphitheater. Mr. Evans replied that it would be grass with concrete block seating.

Motion: BOARDMEMBER EARNEST MOVED TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS AND ALLOW STAFF TO PREPARE A REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENT SPECIFICALLY FOR THE ADDITIONAL SUNSET BEACH IMPROVEMENTS BUDGET:

Playground Equipment	$347,000
Playground Surface	$45,000
Park Furniture	$73,000
Lighting	$81,000
Tiered Amphitheater	$10,000
Maintenance Shed	$70,000

Contingency	$49,000
Total	**$675,000**

BOARDMEMBER FLAKE SECONDED THE MOTION. CHAIR FULLMER, BOARDMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Fullmer called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: BOARDMEMBER FLAKE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:13 PM. BOARDMEMBER EARNEST SECONDED THE MOTION. CHAIR FULLMER, BOARDMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RDA meeting are scheduled as necessary.

MINUTES APPROVED ON: ______________________________________

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer
PAMELA SPENCER, CITY RECORDER