

**WORK SESSION OF THE
BRIGHAM CITY COUNCIL
December 1, 2016
5:30 PM**

PRESENT:	Tyler Vincent	Mayor
	DJ Bott	Councilmember
	Alden Farr	Councilmember
	Ruth Jensen	Councilmember
	Tom Peterson	Councilmember
	Mark Thompson	Councilmember
ALSO PRESENT:	Rick Bosworth	Human Resource
	Mark Bradley	City Planner
	Paul Larsen	Economic Development Director
	Kirk Morgan	City Attorney
	Mike Nelsen	Police Chief
	Derek Oyler	Finance Manager
	Marge Porter	Deputy City Recorder
	Tyler Pugsley	Public Works Director
	Jason Roberts	City Administrator

Employee Incentive Program

Mr. Roberts came to the table and said during the 2016-17 budget meetings, difficulty in retention of employees was discussed. At that time the Council asked staff to look at ways, other than salary, to help with this issue.

During research, staff found that the number one reason employees leave their employment is because of their supervisor; the other is pay.

Mr. Roberts said the first thing staff discussed was what gives employees incentive. It was decided that it depends on the employee, typically based on the employee's generation.

Mr. Bosworth gave a presentation explaining the different generations and their preferred recognition and rewards.

Generation	Preferred Recognition	Preferred Reward
1925-1945 – Silent	No expectation	No expectation
1946-1964 – Baby Boomers	Group, formal	Cash (close to retirement)
1965-1979 – Generation X	Privately	Time off from work (prefer work/life balance)
1980-1994 – Millennial/ Generation Y	Privately, informal, social media	Immediate, often, fun
1995-2010 – Generation Z		

Brigham City Corporation has more employees in the Millennial Generation than any other category; Boomers are next.

Mr. Roberts stated that the Mayor's Office set some high level guidelines for the development of an incentive plan. Department Heads were then asked for input on what they thought their employees would like. Every department developed an incentive plan for their department for the Mayor's approval.

Some examples of recognition/rewards include: 1) one group activity per year; 2) group incentives may be considered (i.e., donuts, pizza, drinks, etc.); 3) individual incentives, such as cash, leave early, gift cards, lunch, personalized awards. It was estimated the new program would cost approximately \$22,224.

The Council was in favor of the proposed plan. A public hearing will be held on December 15, 2016 for a proposed change to the budget to fund it.

Discussion on the Proposed General Plan

Mr. Janson from Silver Solutions led the discussion and asked for any concerns from the Council.

Councilmember Peterson asked how the items in the plan are implemented. Mr. Janson said the plan includes strategies on how to achieve the goals. Mr. Young from Silver Solutions added that there is always one more step before anything is implemented. For example, some of the strategies may require ordinance changes, specific transportation studies, plans or construction documents.

Mayor Vincent agreed that the Council needs to understand the plan, but he also felt that the Council should listen to citizens that have concerns regarding the impact on their property.

Mr. Janson reviewed the changes in the plan since this was last presented to the Council. One is in the Land Use Section regarding 600 North to 1200 West. The property was shown as rural-residential. The comments at the public hearing were that this should be agricultural. These adjustments were made. Ms. Julianna Larsen stated from the audience that the agricultural should be A-5. If not, it eliminates the potential for an agricultural home to have five acres with a house on the same problem. Mr. Janson explained that agricultural does allow residential land use in the agricultural zones. Mr. Bradley added that there are several agricultural zones, such as A-1 and A-5. In addition, the City's Zoning Code sets what is allowed in the A-1 and A-5 districts, not the general plan. The Zoning Code is the implementation tool. Mr. Janson stated that this property is shown as manufacturing in the City's current general plan. He said it is common practice for agricultural to be a holding zone for something else; however, it does not say this in the general plan draft.

Mr. Bradley explained that the Larsens' zoning is currently A-5. Property owners in that area attended some meetings regarding the general plan and stated that they no longer wanted their property designated as industrial. They wanted it designated in the general plan as agricultural so one parcel could be zoned back from a manufacturing to agricultural to be consistent. In the area where homes have been built was referred to as rural-residential, meaning homes in a rural setting on farm property. This is what the residents that lived in the area requested. The Planning Commission was supportive of the request and recommended the change. He added that rural- residential and agriculture is the same thing. The current general plan shows industrial for this area.

Ms. Larsen came to the table and asked about the transportation portion of the plan. There is a proposed road along 900 West to 1175 West. If this is done it will close two more railroad crossings. She asked if the City really wants to do this. Mr. Bradley replied that the intent is to provide connectivity without people having to cross the track, back over and cross the track down the lane. One of the emphases in the transportation plan is to continue to use the grid system, instead of continuing to modify it because it disbursts the traffic and the desired connectivity in neighborhoods. It is possible the railroad will want to close the crossings, but they won't have a right to close it without some kind of negotiation with the City on another access or improvements. Mr. Janson said this creates a larger crossing, but not necessarily shutting off the railroad crossing. Councilmember Peterson said there couldn't be an intersection that close to the railroad. He spoke for the Council and stated that they are not going to close any more railroad crossings.

Councilmember Peterson expressed concern with the idea of having semi traffic down 100 East and 100 West between 100 North and 200 South. He felt this should be eliminated from the plan.

Another concern of Councilmember Peterson's was the proposed TRAX location. He didn't think TRAX will be coming to Brigham City in the near future. The cost to take TRAX from 1100 South nine blocks to the north is astronomical. The current bus system is mostly empty. He felt it would be better to develop a bus route to coordinate with the TRAX train. He did not feel that 200 South behind the high school is the appropriate place for that station.

Mr. Janson said there was a lot of discussion about this from the community. The Steering Committee also debated this. It was felt being closer to downtown was a better option in the long run. Costs are not always looked at in a general plan.

Councilmember Bott said when he was the President of the Chamber of Commerce, he and the Director instigated the quarter cent sales for corridor preservation for UTA to come up. During the discussions with UTA and other municipalities in Northern Utah, Logan, Perry and Brigham City Council at that time preferred the 1100 South site. Logan liked it because they could bring their buses straight down 1100 South to the station.

Councilmember Thompson did not want Brigham City to be develop only on 1100 South. He would rather preserve the downtown. He added that his family has property in the area of 200 South, and they would rather not have it there. But he felt it was best for the City to have it on 200 South.

Councilmember Jensen said the City can hardly support the current traffic. If there is a train station on 200 South the traffic will not be able to support it. Councilmember Peterson added that he did not understand why it should be next to a school, with the increased traffic.

Mayor Vincent said he was also concerned with everything being on 1100 South. It would be better for other communities on 1100 South, but he would like to see it closer to downtown. He did not think having it on 200 South was ideal either, because of the location of the high school.

Mr. Young encouraged the Council to read everything about this in the general plan. They spent hundreds of hours on this issue. It was one of the biggest issues in the document. They talked to hundreds of residents and it was part of the survey. More thought went into this topic than any other. They displayed two maps at the open houses showing proximity of the station to population. A lot of population is close to the train station. Cities that have train stations with population close by get higher ridership from local residents. One of the main decisions was that this was planned for Brigham City, not Perry or Logan. A train station close to downtown is big. Train stations also bring a lot of development. If Brigham City wants something similar to Station Park in Farmington, only smaller, on 1100 South it will kill the downtown. They did a train station master plan for Vineyard and a lot of development will follow this. Mr. Janson added that a lot of residents felt that the best spot for the train station was on 200 South. He reinforced that this general plan is a recommendation and can be changed. If the Council wants to change it, there are other areas of the plan that will also have to change, such as the land use map, the transit oriented development area, as well as other parts of it. They understood that some kind of decision needed to be made on the station. Their process led them to 200 South. However, it is a recommendation and the Council makes the final decision.

Mayor Vincent said it will be many years before TRAX comes to Brigham City. Mr. Bradley agreed that it will probably be 2030 or 2040 before TRAX will be in Brigham City. The development will not function like Farmington Station. People will not travel from Roy or Ogden to shop in Brigham City. It is more to serve the population in a different means as a commuter station. When the City put out the request for proposal for the general plan, this was a proponent that needed to be discussed further. It has

been in the general plan on 200 South, but there have been a lot of different discussions off and on by previous mayors, Perry's interest, spacing issues between Brigham City and Willard Station. All this was taken into consideration. Due to the fact findings the consultants had to provide, they are asking the Council to read the information that has been provided because there was a lot of outreach.

Councilmember Jensen said when she was young, if a person lived next to the tracks it was a bad place to live. She did not understand why the City is going to put housing there, or to think that people will build houses there and get on the train. Councilmember Bott said they currently do in other communities. Councilmember Jensen said that is because they live in high-density areas. Brigham City is still rural.

Mr. Janson said the general plan suggests a more high density transit oriented development area near the station. It would not necessarily be single family homes.

The general plan will be discussed again during a work session on December 15, 2016.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 PM.

The undersigned duly appointed Recorder for Brigham City Corporation hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of the December 1, 2016 City Council Meeting.

Dated this 15th day of December, 2016.

Mary Kate Christensen
Mary Kate Christensen, Recorder