

**WORK SESSION OF THE
BRIGHAM CITY COUNCIL TO
REVIEW THE GENERAL PLAN
January 19, 2017
6:00 PM**

PRESENT:	Tyler Vincent	Mayor
	DJ Bott	Councilmember
	Alden Farr	Councilmember
	Ruth Jensen	Councilmember
	Tom Peterson	Councilmember
	Mark Thompson	Councilmember
ALSO PRESENT:	Mark Bradley	City Planner
	Mary Kate Christensen	City Recorder
	Paul Larsen	Community Development Director
	Tyler Pugsley	Public Works Director
	Jason Roberts	City Administrator
	Dennis Vincent	Assistant Police Chief
	Jake Young	Civil Solutions Consultant
	Levi Roberts	Utah Transit Authority

Transportation

Commuter Rail

Councilmember Thompson asked if there are any future plans to connect the FrontRunner to Logan. Mr. Levi Roberts said there are no plans at this time to bring transit to Logan. The current Regional Transportation Plan states that bringing it to Logan is financially constrained based on projected revenues.

Phase I of the plan is to do right-of-way preservation. UTA is currently working to preserve sections of this right-of-way. The second quarter of the sales tax is going toward that. So far there has been \$5M that has accumulated. In Box Elder County he estimated it is at \$7-10M. To get the FrontRunner from Ogden to Box Elder County will cost approximately \$30M.

A study done in 2007 concluded that commuter rail was the preferred alternative to meet economic development objectives, reducing vehicle miles traveled and providing an alternative. There have been some changes since that study. It costs more than what was projected in the study. It is estimated it will cost \$500M to bring commuter rail from Ogden to Brigham City, \$26M of that will be for rights-of-way. They estimate \$25M a mile.

Mr. Levi Roberts said the congestion at this point is not as bad as they predicted. It was projected at 60,000 but it is closer to 42,000. There a few factors why it has not increased as much as it was. It could be more localized commuting, more people working from home and gas prices are down.

Regarding the location of the station, Mr. Levi Roberts said UTA does not have a preferred location. They want to support the community. His opinion, and the opinion of several of his colleagues, is that there are a lot of advantages to the location on 200 South. In general, people are more likely to take transit if they can walk there. The stations that are doing well are in established communities with a population that can walk to the station. He added that the Regional Transportation Plan is being updated and it will incorporate Brigham City in the model. They are looking at the two locations to determine how the ridership will differ. In addition, UTA commissioned a study on the future of the FrontRunner to look at any future expansions or enhancements. This should be completed by the end of the year. The plan will look at whether the station should be at 200 South or 1100 South and whether it should be an enhanced bus service.

Councilmember Farr said he did not think this should be in the general plan. Mr. Bradley said Brigham City is part of the UTA Plan and the Wasatch Front Regional Plan. He questioned how removing it would benefit the City. Mr. Levi Roberts said one of the goals in the initial study was economic development. The reality is that buses do not offer the same kind of economic development as a commuter rail station would. The study projected that more people would ride commuter rail although the cost per rider is much higher than bus service.

Mr. Levi Roberts added that it would help UTA if there was a definitive answer on where the station should be, because they are working on right-of-way preservation.

Councilmember Farr felt that it should be south of 1100 South. This would serve Cache Valley and people off the interstate. Councilmember Peterson asked if the 1100 South location would be in Brigham City or Perry. Mr. Levi Roberts said it would be on the border. Councilmember Peterson questioned if it should even be in Brigham City's general plan if it is going to be on 1100 South, or if it should stay as it is in the general plan and let development dictate where it will be.

Mr. Bradley said at the next City Council meeting he will present a master street development plan for the Upland Square project site. The developers have been in contact with UTA regarding the corridor preservation. They have no plans for commuter rail at this location.

Mr. Young added that the general plan process has led them to 200 South. They have had open houses, tables, and surveys that indicated 200 South was the preferred location. He felt that part of the reason it was preferred is because people recognized that there are more benefits to having it in town.

Councilmember Bott said if 200 South remains in the general plan, developers will be told that future development is geared toward transit development.

Councilmember Peterson was concerned with the development north of 1100 South. If the City believes the station will be located in this area then the right-of-way needs to be purchased, which will reduce the buildable area. He did not think 200 South will have major development.

Mr. Levi Roberts stated that when a developer invests a lot of money in a TOD, they want to see the train station there. He added that there is a one buffer process. It would have to go to zoning, so the Council could disagree with the zoning until the train is coming.

Councilmember Peterson said he did not see a TOD fitting at 200 South. It could, however, fit on 1100 South and it makes more sense for it to be there because of the traffic flow.

The Council will make a decision on this in two weeks, after the developer's master street and development plans are presented.

One-way Streets

Mr. Young said there are several suggestions in the plan for the trucking and congestion issues. The more expensive ones are the interchanges at the mouth of the canyon and across the railroad. A shorter term suggestion is making 100 West and 100 East as possible bypasses for downtown. This will be discussed further at the next meeting. He reminded the Council that these are only suggestions.

Incomplete Sidewalk Systems

Councilmember Peterson said the plan talks about incomplete sidewalk systems. He agreed that this is a major issue. Unfortunately, the Council has a known record of deferring sidewalks. He felt that this needs to stop.

Mr. Young said the plan suggests that Councils reconsider doing deferrals.

Councilmember Jensen asked what the Council should do to make it fair. Councilmember Peterson said if a person is developing property and making money, it is fair that they put in the sidewalk. Councilmember Jensen said there are times when there is a strip of sidewalk and no sidewalk anywhere else along the street and it creates a hardship for the widow who sold her property.

Mr. Young said a lot of communities require the developer to pay for the sidewalk at that time and put it in an escrow account. There are some ideas in the plan on how to address this.

Connectivity

Councilmember Peterson asked if there is any reason the City would want to connect large commercial development to low density housing development. He declared a conflict of interest as he was specifically referring to the property near his home.

Mr. Young explained the issue in this area is access problems. The theory is that it will create more connections and less congestion.

Councilmember Peterson agreed with that, but did not agree that the path of least resistance for all of Brigham City to be in a quiet residential neighborhood.

Mr. Larsen said one of the rationales for having more connectivity is that it gives more options for people, which creates less congestion.

Mr. Young said in the land use section this area is shown as commercial. It could have been the entire area. The question is whether this general plan is the ultimate plan, or a 20-year plan. If it's the ultimate plan then the commercial should be throughout. Councilmember Peterson felt that it is a ten year plan and this area will be all filled with commercial. Mr. Young said there was nothing in their market economic development that all this area will fill in.

Mr. Bradley said this is why there are local streets that tie into collector streets, that tie into the minor artillery streets. Something needs to be done so all the traffic doesn't go to 500 West. Once the frontage road opens up it will tie into 1100 West. There has to be access for the residents in this area to get to the frontage road then to 1100 or 500 West.

The Council met in a City Council meeting following this work session at 7:00 PM.