Mayor Wood called the meeting to order 6:10 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE PARK CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN AND PARK IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, reminded the Council of the presentation given during the January 22, 2013 work session and emphasized impact fees were based upon the Capital Facilities Plan which looked at the City’s current level of service based on the existing park and trail acreage and amenities. He continued that information was then compared to the City’s current population to determine a number symbolizing the level of service which would be used to project future growth. He stated the goal was determine the additional development of parks/trails which was needed to maintain the current level of service based upon the estimated future growth.

Mr. Howes reminded the Council Lewis Young Robertson & Burningham (LYRB) had presented three separate approaches and reviewed each with the Council: the facilities approach, the level of investment approach and the hybrid approach. He suggested the Council determine which approach it was most comfortable with and then work on designating an appropriate number from there.
Mr. Howes explained the facilities approach was based on an estimated cost per acre of $218,744. He continued the estimate was based on the current sales of property located within the general area per acre and pointed out the difficulties in estimating park acreage costs. He stated the level of investment approach was based on historical information; the original cost per acre was low and the improvement cost per acre was approximately $90,236. He explained the final approach was the hybrid which was a combination of both previous approaches in which the estimated current land cost of $218,744 was combined with the improvement costs based on historical figures. He requested the Council express its preference then determine if the costs per acre needed to be adjusted with a figure the Council was more comfortable with.

Mr. Howes reviewed the proposed impact fee schedule and pointed out figures were the maximum and could be decreased if the Council desired. He emphasized the figures were based upon the City maintaining the current levels of service and pointed out if the level of service was decreased in order to lower the dollar figure there were consequences to consider: the first would be a reduction in the level of service and the second would be the existing residents would be paying for future park development.

Councilmember Young inquired about the differences between the level of investment and the hybrid approaches specific to flexibility. Mr. Howes expressed his opinion there would be more flexibility in spending impact fee funds with both the level of investment and the hybrid approach.

Councilmember Bush announced the hybrid approach would be his preference because of the flexibility with potentially using the funds for both facilities and purchasing property. Mr. Howes stated the hybrid approach would be his recommendation because it would meet the anticipated future needs.

Councilmember LeBaron inquired as to what area of the City the future residents would be residing at build out. Mr. Howes responded it was anticipated they would be living in housing developed with the TOD (Transit Oriented Development). Councilmember LeBaron expressed concern about the costs associated with that specific area and suggested the City consider not acting at this time but consider a wait and see approach. Councilmember Shepherd believed the City could require the developer of the housing component to include a park with the development.

Mr. Howes pointed out recent changes to State Code had precipitated the need to complete the impact fee analysis and capital facilities plan. Mr. Lenhard emphasized all figures in the proposed options were the maximum. Councilmember Young believed current residents shouldn’t be impacted by new housing development and based on that expressed his opinion the impact fee should be increased. He believed if the developer were willing to contribute a park facility the value could be decreased or eliminated from the impact fee. Mr. Howes emphasized the ordinance would need to be written with verbiage reflecting that action. Mr. Lenhard
emphasized the developer probably wouldn’t complete a park to the City’s standards and therefore believed those residents would impact the City’s current park facilities. A discussion took place.

Councilmember Shepherd suggested implementing the hybrid approach while matching Layton City’s impact fee and nothing higher. He expressed concern a higher impact fee could potentially discourage residential development. Councilmember Young pointed out park impact associated with multi family was greater because of the number of potential residents. A discussion took place specific to the amount of the impact fee and percentages based on the consultant’s recommended impact fee. Mr. Howes pointed out the consultant recommended the City apply the percentage of the proposed fee equally and consistently specific to single family or multi family.

Brian Brower, City Attorney, stated he didn’t want to suggest the Council adopt less than the consultant’s recommendation; however, he believed it would be in the best interest of the City to not implementing the highest recommended fee and suggested it would illustrate the City’s intentions of being reasonable in determining its impact fee.

Councilmember LeBaron stated he could support the hybrid approach. Councilmember Young stated he desired flexibility. He continued if a developer donated park land the City should have the option to apply its value toward any park impact fee. Mayor Wood expressed his opinion the $218,000 per acre was excessive and shared his experiences associated with purchasing property for North Davis Corridor and Wasatch Integrated. Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, explained the consultant determined that cost based upon zip code and believed the majority of the property was associated with development in Clinton City.

Mr. Howes requested direction from the Council. A discussion took place regarding desired levels of service specific to the City’s park facilities and the proposed impact fees. Mayor Wood emphasized the City needed to determine if the current level of service being provided were sufficient. Mr. Howes responded there was never enough space for the City’s recreation programs. The Council determined the hybrid approach would in the best interest of the City.

Mr. Lenhard explained whatever impact fee the Council adopted could always be revisited in the future and suggested the Council consider a tiered approach for the impact fees and shared some examples. Councilmember Bush commented the tiered approach suggested by Mr. Lenhard would also allow for development of the rail stop. Councilmember Shepherd stated the housing component would be developed first and pointed out the importance of adopting an appropriate impact fee. Councilmember Young believed the City should have a fee in place ahead of the rail stop development. He suggested the City adopt a fee of a lesser dollar amount and allow the fee to be comparable to neighboring cities.

Mr. Howes indicated he would work on figuring the proposed numbers and present it at a later time during the meeting.
DISCUSSION ON THE 2013/2014 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

Bob Wylie, Administrative Services Director, indicated a large portion of the budget would be presented during tonight’s meeting. He distributed a copy of the Consolidated Fee Schedule and emphasized this was an itemized list of everything the City assessed fees for and pointed out the Council had input on these fees.

Steve Guy, City Treasurer, referred to the handout reflecting previous Fiscal Years’ revenues. A discussion took place specific to sales tax, business licenses, building permits and donations. Mr. Wylie emphasized the Council had some discretion in assessing most of these fees.

Councilmember Young inquired how the Class C road funds were calculated. Mr. Wylie explained it was based upon the number of miles of roads within the city. Mr. Lenhard reported there was some proposed legislation specific to an increase in gas tax at the State level.

REPORT ON THE PROPOSED IMPACT FEE

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, explained using a figure of $130,000 per acre didn’t have much of a significant impact as originally thought because there was no “buy in” for existing amenities. A discussion took place specific to the “buy in” for existing park facilities. Mr. Howes pointed out the current impact fees had not been changed since 1997. Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, pointed out some of our neighboring communities had a lower level of service as they didn’t have an aquatic center.

Councilmember Shepherd proposed basing the impact fee at seventy five percent of the $130,000 per acre calculation as it would be defendable but not the maximum amount. The Council was in agreement with that proposal and directed Mr. Howes to proceed with that formula in figuring an impact fee.

The Council took a break at 7:15 p.m.
The meeting resumed at 7:26 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON CAPITAL PROJECTS AND EQUIPMENT

Bob Wylie, Administrative Services Director, referred to the handout identifying proposed Capital Equipment purchases for the 2013/2014 budget year. He reviewed the capital equipment notes with the Council:

- Chief Krusi distributed a handout explaining the mobile forensics device which can access information from cell phones which could be used in police investigations
- Postage machine
- Vehicle replacement fund
- Court security door
- Bleachers for Steed and Kiwanis Parks
- Storm sewer replacement grates
• Eric Howes, Community Services Director and Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, reviewed the proposed fleet equipment purchases

Mr. Wylie requested Eric Howes, Community Services Director, review the requested capital projects with the Council

• Entry upgrade at the Community Arts Center
• Replace stucco soffits at Community Arts Center
• Wood paneling replacement in the theater
• PA system for City Office Building
• Barlow and West Park Village Parks projects

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, reviewed the requested capital projects associated with Public Works with the Council.

• Phase 1 of Public Works Facility
• Street overlays
• Street seal coating
• Traffic signal 700 South 1000 West

The Council determined the proposed traffic signal could wait until the 200 South road configuration was completed associated with the SR 193 extension and requested it be eliminated from the budget at this time.

• CDBG 450 W – 2225 S to 2300 S
• Check valve and vault – 25 S 1000 W
• Water line 1000 E
• Close the Wood Cross Cannery well
• Freeport water tank repair
• HAFB well building ventilation
• Public works facility phase 1
• Transfer water rights from 750 East well to HAFB
• Bruce Street sewer upgrade project
• Sewer Line 1000 E
• Freeport 3rd street sewer upgrade

Mr. Wylie asked if there were any questions. Mr. Lenhard pointed out additional projects had been identified and would be addressed at a later date. Mr. Wylie informed the Council it was anticipated to present a tentative budget to the Council in April.
Councilmember Murray requested clarification regarding the expenditure in the General Fund, water, sewer, storm sewer and solid waste funds. Mr. Lenhard explained the total cost was an estimate and staff had divided that figure amongst the five accounts.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.
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