PAYSON CITY
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING
Payson City Center, 439 W. Utah Avenue, Payson UT 84651
Wednesday, July 9, 2025

CONDUCTING	Brian Hulet, Director
MEMBERS PRESENT	William R. Wright, Mayor (7:55 p.m.) Brian Hulet, Economic Development Director/City Council David Charles, Business Owner (7:37 p.m.) Jim Rowland, Payson Santaquin Chamber of Commerce Tyler Jones, Business Owner (7:43 p.m.) Kris Phillips, Stadium Cinemas Mark Kershaw, Resident
EXCUSED	Ben Ford, Nebo School District Lynn Abplanalp, PPC Flexible Packaging Kevin Johnson, Mountain View Hospital Larry Skinner, Resident
STAFF	Dave Tuckett, City Manager Robert Mills, Assistant City Manager Jill Spencer, Development Services Director Kim E. Holindrake, City Recorder
OTHERS	Scott Wolford, Utah Inland Port Authority

1. Call to Order

Brian Hulet called this meeting of the Economic Development Board of Payson City, Utah, to order at 7:35 a.m. The meeting was properly noticed.

2. Prior Minutes Approval

MOTION: Mark Kershaw – To approve the June 11, 2025, minutes. Motion seconded by Dave Tuckett. Those voting yes: Brian Hulet, Kris Phillips, Jim Rowland, Robert Mills, Dave Tuckett, Mark Kershaw. The motion carried.

3. Inland Port (7:37 p.m.)

Scott Wolford gave a brief history. In 2018, the Utah State Legislature created the jurisdictional land area of the UIPA, which includes about 16,000 acres in the northwest quadrant of Salt Lake City along with small portions of Magna City, West Valley City, and Salt Lake County. The UIPA board had 11 members and was semi-dysfunctional with three-hour meetings of mostly public comment and board members disagreeing with one another. There wasn't a clean alignment on the responsibilities of an inland port and high-level objectives that weren't shared among the board members. In 2022, the UIPA board was reduced to five voting members and three ex officio non-voting members as well as a new executive director, Ben Hart. Between creation and the narrowing or purpose, Salt Lake City sued the state noting that it looked, smelled, and acted like a municipality, which it's not. UIPA is a Title 11 subdivision of the state and doesn't have residents. The state prevailed at both the district and Supreme Court levels. Ben Hart then redirected the UIPA with the primary focus of creating projects of regional economic significance with a backend focus to right-size public investment in logistical assets through those entities. Since that time, UIPA has received 40 resolutions from communities throughout Utah that has created 14 project areas, which represent over 132,000 acres of developable property across the state. UIPA's toolbox includes project area creation, rail & Logistics, public private partnerships, public financing, regional promotion, branding and branding expansion, tax differential community reinvestment, federal and customs interface, international shipping connections, and sustainability support. Project area creation is the most effective, which is a tax layer similar to an RDA or CRA. This allows UIPA to freeze the tax layer for the properties in the project area. There is no value in this for something that is built out. Then 25% of the increase for 25 years flows to the taxing entities, and 75% goes to UIPA to be reinvested in that project area for roads, infrastructure, etc. He noted that a CRA the land use authority speaks for all the taxing entities so there is no negotiation between because it's statutory. At first, school districts felt this took their money, but in reality that money didn't exist. Since, school districts have asked about internships, other facets, and receiving reports. He noted UIPA has no land use authority, permitting authority, zoning authority, or ability to move tax differential outside of the project area. Each project area is assigned an associate vice president to help communities build out their vision. To date, UIPA has secured about $2.5 billion for project area communities which represents 37,000 jobs and about of 3.5 million square feet of industrial space. A project area requires four statutory conditions, i.e., public good, public benefit, economic feasibility, and statutory alignment. The process includes Resolve (project area resolution), Draft (project area plan draft & budget), Adopt (UIPA project adoption in a public meeting), and Build & Measure (construction, development, recruitment).

Discussion:

- UIPA gets $3 million for general appropriation costs for administrative costs. UIPA takes 5% of the differential to administer the project area. Nothing is fixed because it's based on the property value. The funding mechanism is through bonding and the taxes pay for the bond. A city could take a percentage for administration such as hiring an economic director.
- Most RFI's fit to one or two project areas, which are usually the larger project areas.
- Projects come through EDC Utah (58.5), UIPA (26%), Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity (11%), Northern Utah Economic Alliance (4%), and a small remainder.
- UIPA is working on targeted instead of reactive recruitment.
- It's best to incorporate unused lands into a project area such as just using the remaining portion of an RDA. Used lands can be incorporated and a little bit of housing has been done as well. It's best not to have the project area overlap and RDA.
- Public perception is positive outside of Salt Lake Valley.
- A sports complex is interested in coming to Payson and would be considered a workforce amenity and community builder, which can be included in the bond.
- There have been discussions with Utah State and Snow College regarding buildings. If another entity comes into a project area that needs available workforce training, it's possible to work a college building into a project area.
- UIPA partially funded the Springville/Spanish Fork interchange study. It's could be done in Payson as well by working with UDOT. UIPA as a statewide entity has a loud voice.
- Rail is less of a driver but an asset to be increased. UIPA talks with Union Pacific three to four times a week. A new rail player is entering Utah soon, which will create competition with Union Pacific. Payson has great opportunities for rail.

4. Committee Reports, Assignments, and Goals

Item not addressed.

5. Budget (8:26 a.m.)

Brian Hulet reported that the economic development fund has built up to about $41,000. He asked the board to bring ideas to the next meeting that can effectively spend the funds for economic drivers in Payson. Think in and out of the box.

Jim Rowland noted the UVU/MTECH Committee is planning a meeting with the Chamber in August to teach them about internships. He wondered if these funds could pay for the lunch. Mark Kershaw noted that if it's held at the MTECH building, the culinary program may be involved and the funds could help purchase food.

6. Sports Complex

Item not addressed.

7. Innovation Center

Item not addressed.

8. Golf Event

Item not addressed.

9. Vision Statement

Item not addressed.

10. Report on Things Happening in Payson

Item not addressed.

11. Report from City

Item not addressed.

12. Other

Item not addressed.

13. Adjourn

This meeting was adjourned at 8:30 a.m.