VINEYARD
STAY CONNECTED

MINUTES OF A VINEYARD REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD WORK SESSION

This meeting was held electronically, via Zoom,
due to the COVID-19 gathering restrictions
June 10, 2020 – 6:01 PM

Present	Absent
Chair Fullmer	
Boardmember John Earnest	
Boardmember Tyce Flake	
Boardmember Chris Judd	
Boardmember Cristy Welsh	

Staff Present: City Manager Jacob McHargue, Public Works Director/City Engineer Don Overson, Community Development Director Morgan Brim, Water/Parks Manager Sullivan Love, City Recorder Pamela Spencer

Others Speaking: Pete Evans and Stewart Park with Anderson Geneva

6:01 PM REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD MEETING

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Fullmer called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM. Boardmember Judd gave the invocation.

2. WORK SESSION

2.1 DISCUSSION – RDA Remediation Update

City Manager Jacob McHargue will present an update on the remediation of the Geneva Site. No action will be taken.

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

Mr. McHargue explained that this would be a discussion about the cleanup projects on the Geneva site and the big RDA projects. He showed an updated picture of the Corrective Action Management Unit (CAMU).

Stewart Park with Anderson Geneva gave an update on the east side remediation. He said that there were four (4) major projects on the east side.

1. Coke byproducts area
2. Benzol plant
3. Tar ponds – have been removed and placed in the CAMU
4. Closed Hazardous Waste Impoundment Area – located off of 1600 North near Geneva Road

There was a discussion about the tar ponds, the smell, and when they would be finished with the cleanup. US Steel expected that the CAMU should be finished this fall.

Pete Evans with Anderson Geneva explained that the contractor had completed the removal of the byproducts from the pond but there were other areas where tar needed to be removed from, which should take about 60 days. Mr. McHargue mentioned that the process had been changed to mitigate the smell. The discussion continued.

Mr. Park reviewed the projects on the west Side of the Geneva property:

1. Storm Drain – was completed about a year and a half year ago.
2. Oil Reclamation Area (ORA) Material – about 50% of the material had been moved to the south end and now it had been moved to the east side for road fill. They had made room to finish cleanup of the sludge material (SI5) on the west side.
3. North Tip Repository – was finished and had been capped with clean soil and seeded.

Mr. Park mentioned that the removal of the SI5 material had created dust issues. He said that they had been working with the Utah Department of Air Quality (DAQ) on dust control. They were seeding the south end of property to help mitigate the dust issues and they would continue to monitor it. Chair Fullmer mentioned that people could contact the city with complaints or for updates on the mitigation plan.

Chair Fullmer asked if the settling pond was part of the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) permit. Mr. Park felt that it fell under the overall permit for the site but because it was on state land there would be additional approvals. He said that there were impacted materials at the bottom of the pond so they were thinking about backfilling it. There was a discussion about what could be done with the settling pond area.

Mr. McHargue said that there would be around $2,000,000 left in the west side cleanup budget. He suggested that the money could be used for other RDA projects. He explained that most of the CAMU work on the east side was being paid for by US Steel. He further explained that after the CAMU was built there would be additional costs for a final grading of the area. They also had the budget for the excess materials, so any materials that could be use on site, would reduce the amount of money needed for the cleanup. He added that they no longer needed the budgeted money for the Temporary Onsite Storage Area (TOSSA) so they could reallocate that money to other projects.

Concrete Crushing – Mr. McHargue explained that three (3) years ago there was an approval given for concrete crushing with a $2,500,000 budget. He said that there was no funding source so they would have had to front load it or wait until the increment was available. He mentioned that Anderson Geneva was now working with a new contractor.

Mr. Park explained that they had asked another firm to do an analysis and evaluation of what they were dealing with on the concrete. The older concrete on the site was very hard and there were basements that were as deep as 40 feet, but not all of the concrete needed to be removed. He said that the contractor had done a six-week evaluation of the process to determine how much it would cost to remove the concrete. It would cost around $35,000,000 to $40,000,000 to remove it over a three- to four-year time period. He said that the cost could be offset by using offsite concrete.

Mr. McHargue explained that when Gerald Anderson first approached the RDA, he had no idea how much it was going to cost to remove the concrete but wanted a budget approved and that was why they approved the $2,500,000. Mr. Evans felt that it made sense to have one (1) company crushing and processing the concrete and to allow them to bring in offsite concrete to offset the cost.

Boardmember Earnest asked for clarification on the concrete operation and the difference in the costs. Mr. Evans replied that there was value to crushed concrete; it could be used as an aggregate road base or other subgrade building products. He said that the challenge was that the concrete was all underground, reinforced with rebar and aggregate, and that it was labor intensive and hard on machinery. He explained that the concrete company would be able to charge other companies to bring in concrete from offsite. They would then mix it with the onsite concrete, crush it up, and sell it. This would offset the cost to excavate the onsite material.

Boardmember Welsh asked if there was a difference in the timeline. Mr. Evans replied that it would not slow down the process. There was a discussion about the process.

Boardmember Judd expressed concern with the city not allowing concrete crushing in the code and having a monopoly in the city. Mr. McHargue explained that there were things that needed to be worked out. Chair Fullmer felt that they should have a conditional use permit, a timeline, and have them reapply each year. Mr. Evans felt that the contractor would want more than a one-year permit and agreed that there were still things that needed to be worked out. There was a discussion about the issues from the last concrete crushing operation.

Mr. Brim felt that if they allowed outside crushing, then they should do it through a development agreement with constraints and not open the zoning code too wide to allow other crushing operations to come into the city.

Boardmember Judd asked what benefit the new contractor had that the old contractor did not have. Mr. Evans replied that there was no incentive for the old contactor to excavate the concrete because the economics were upside down. He added that this was why they had the new contractor compile data and see what it would take to get the concrete out of the ground.

Mr. Park said that Dunn Construction (Dunn) did not have the equipment to dig up the concrete. He said that Anderson Geneva had anticipated that developers would dig up the concrete and take it to Dunn. He added that the new contractor had a bigger operation.

Boardmember Earnest said that he was open to continuing the conversation to save the RDA money and that the city's needs were being met. Boardmember Judd wanted to know how they would ensure that they kept removing the concrete. Mr. McHargue suggested that they put a minimum amount of onsite concrete in the contract that was done each year. Mr. Park mentioned that they had discussed this with the contractor.

Boardmember Judd asked about what risk there was of the contractor, at any given point, saying that they could no longer do the work. Mr. Evans replied that the risk would be supply and demand. They may have to renegotiate to keep them working.

Mr. McHargue said that over the next couple weeks, staff would meet with Anderson Geneva to work through any concerns the city might have and to include the right mechanism so they did not open up the city to concrete crushing.

3.1 DISCUSSION – <u>RDA PROJECTS</u>

The RDA Board and city staff will discuss RDA projects. No action will be taken.

Mr. McHargue explained that they had a lot of RDA projects that were unfunded. He said that Main Street and the Mill Road extension were the main projects that were not funded. He said that some of the cleanup money that was tied to the 2017 Bond would not be used for at least five (5) years and suggested that they allocate some of these funds to other projects and then replenish the funds with tax increment. He said that they would need to put together an agreement to protect the RDA in case the increment dried up a little. He felt that this would allow the RDA to get these types of projects done now.

Boardmember Judd felt that it was important for people to understand that the RDA would create tax increment through economic development, cleanup, and infrastructure. He also felt that it was a good idea to take the funds and use them to do projects that would produce increment sooner.

Boardmember Earnest asked Mr. McHargue to outline the two projects he had mentioned.

Mr. McHargue pointed out where the projects were located. He mentioned that a street light was being installed on Mill Road and the Vineyard Connector (Connector). He explained that Mill Road would be extended to 1600 North. Boardmember Earnest asked if Main Street should be a higher priority. Mr. McHargue replied that there was clean up on the east side that might hold up some projects, but there were companies who were willing to come in on the east side once Mill Road was extended.

Chair Fullmer said that if they were to extend Mill Road then the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) could be built to Mill Road and the Vineyard Connector. She added that if Mill Road were extended, it could take some of the traffic off of the Connector.

Mr. McHargue explained that the Main Street loop for the train station needed to happen sooner, but felt that both projects were a high priority.

Boardmember Welsh asked if The Forge Development was not happening because Mill Road had not been extended. Mr. Park replied that there were new owners of the property, who were not willing to build anything until they had a tenant. Mr. Brim mentioned that there was a company wanted to build on both sides of the Connector but there was no access to the north property. There was a discussion about development off of Mill Road. Chair Fullmer added that it had been the same issue for schools and hotels that had looked at the property. She added that there were also companies who wanted to be able to get their bigger vehicles of off the Connector and had the same issue with Mill Road not being extended.

Mr. McHargue mentioned that the Mill Road extension was crucial for looping the water system. Mr. Overson explained the need for the water line.

Boardmember Earnest asked if they could do both projects. Mr. McHargue replied that the goal would be to get both of them funded.

Mr. McHargue mentioned that staff had had meetings with CRSA Architecture (CRSA) about the train station. He said that CRSA was getting close to a point where they needed to have design ideas for the train station and needed to know what betterments the RDA wanted on the station.

Mr. Brim said that he had a meeting with CRSA and Freeform Polymers, who make

polycarbonate paneling. He explained that the initial platform would have two (2) canopies with two (2) bench seating areas under each canopy, with three (3) 4’x5’panels behind each of the benches.
Suggested betterments could be:

- Print images of historical photos, maps, etc. right onto the panels.
- Adding projectors on each end of the platform, which would cast images or messages down on the concrete.
- Install three (3) public art stations on pedestals where a sculpture or historical artifact could be located. Mr. Brim suggested that the city could engage or commission art pieces. The costs for the artwork would be based off of the artists’ commissions.

Mr. Brim showed examples of the art pieces from other stations. He suggested that they could add the art pedestals now and then add the artwork later.

There was a discussion about why the panels were there. Boardmember Earnest asked if the panels would remain clear if the RDA did not fund the betterments. Mr. Brim replied yes. He said that they could just add colored glass and mentioned that he was getting costs for the betterments. Chair Fullmer explained that other cities installed betterments for aesthetics and to help deter crime.

Mr. Brim showed examples of different panels that could be installed. Boardmember Judd asked if the current platform, in the long-term goals, would stay the same or if staff envision making changes, in say five (5) years. Mr. Brim replied that the panels would come in right away and that they needed to pick photos that they would want to display for a long time. He suggested that, for the public art, they get the pedestals in place now and add the artwork later with the option to rotate it out.

Boardmember Judd felt that if there was going to be a building added to the station then they should wait, but if this was all there was going to be, then they should install the betterments now. Mr. Brim said that Utah Transit Authority (UTA) gave them guidelines on what they could and could not modify. He mentioned the Plaza that would be next to the train station. Chair Fullmer explained that the idea of walking into a building from the train had been put back into the Downtown Vineyard area so the city could have more control over the project and work with the developer.

Boardmember Judd asked if what Mr. Brim was suggesting would be maxing out what they could do on the actual platform. Mr. Brim replied yes. There was a discussion about the design. Mr. Brim said that they needed to decide where the art pedestals would be placed now if they were going to add them. Mr. McHargue added that the sculptures could be added later.

Chair Fullmer asked how UTA would be heating the platform. Mr. Overson replied that they were going to use boilers. There was a discussion about the heating system.

Mr. Brim said that he would get the itemized cost estimates for the next meeting. Mr. Overson mentioned that UTA was trying to have the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) completed by the end of June so they would need to know Vineyard’s plans before that.

There was a discussion about the artwork that they could have on the platform.

Mr. McHargue turned time over to Public Works Director/City Engineer Don Overson.

Mr. Overson said that the Center Street Overpass was on schedule to be completed this fall. He mentioned that the intersection at Vineyard Road and Center Street had opened back up last Friday. He explained that the settlement period for the overpass had been completed and the contractor was removing the overburden material. He said that the contractor would finish the Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) retaining wall and start placing the piles at the end of the month. He said that the pile driving would take about a week, from 8:00 AM to 6 or 7 PM each night. He stated that the community had been notified, the contractor had taken videos of the homes, and that they would be installing instruments to measure the vibrations. Mr. McHargue added that the city would also be doing social media posts about the pile driving process.

Chair Fullmer asked if there would be a tree line behind LeCheminant. Mr. Overson replied that they should plan on it and that the city had decided to take care of the landscaping once the project was far enough along to plant trees.

Mr. Overson explained that they had selected a location for a water tank on the Orem Community Hospital property off of 400 North in Orem. He said that they were in the process of getting the property rezoned and then they would be able to finalize the design and get the tank built. There was a discussion about the property.

Mr. McHargue explained that, because of the federal grant they had received for the rail spur removal, they had to include Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) in the project and renegotiate the contract with Union Pacific (UP). He said that they had met with UDOT and felt that they had a final draft of the agreement that would be acceptable to all parties. He said that they had asked UDOT to move forward with the design of the project.

Chair Fullmer felt that UP had been a good partner on this project and that working with the state had been helpful. She hoped that, after they reviewed the redlines, they would be able to get moving on the project. There was a discussion about the process they went through to get the contract to where it was now.

Boardmember Judd asked about the weeds along the Vineyard Connector on the south side in front of Tucker Row. There was a discussion about the weeds. Mr. Overson explained that the property was owned by UDOT, who was allowing the city to build at trail on the property. He said that he would work on eradicating the weeds.

Boardmember Welsh asked what landscaping would go along the trail. Mr. Overson replied that it would be whatever the city needed to do.

Boardmember Judd asked who was responsible for the trees that were dying in certain areas of the city. Boardmember Welsh mentioned that she was getting ready to send in a work ticket to the city about trees by her house. There was a discussion about the dying trees. Mr. McHargue explained that a lot the trees had been tagged and cataloged and staff was working with Flagship Homes to get them replaced.

Chair Fullmer asked, at what point in the Center Street Overpass design process would they be able to include an opportunity for artwork. Mr. Overson replied that they could add artwork at the city's expense on the west side of the overpass. The east side was owned by someone else. Mayor Fullmer suggested that they get a sponsor to look into adding art under the overpass.

Mr. McHargue stated that the final budget would be adopted on June 24. He said that they had received the certified tax rate, the updated sales tax estimates, and the population data. He mentioned that Vineyard had the lowest census response rate in the county and needed help getting people to fill out the census.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Fullmer called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: BOARDMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:41 PM. BOARDMEMBER EARNEST SECONDED THE MOTION. CHAIR FULLMER, BOARDMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND WELSH WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RDA meetings are scheduled as necessary.

MINUTES APPROVED ON: June 24, 2020

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