

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.



## **PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL Redevelopment Agency Governing Board Regular Meeting Agenda**

5:30 PM, Tuesday, February 10, 2026

Council Chambers (Room 100)

445 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601 or

<https://www.youtube.com/provocitycouncil>

### **Roll Call**

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATION WERE PRESENT:

Councilor Becky Bogdin

Councilor Craig Christensen

Councilor Gary Garrett

Councilor Katrice MacKay

Councilor Rachel Whipple

Councilor Jeff Whitlock

Council Executive Director Justin Harrison

Mayor Marsha Judkins

Chief Administrative Officer Scott Henderson

City Attorney Brian Jones

City Recorder Heidi Allman

Conducting: Chair Katrice MacKay

Excused: Councilor Travis Hoban

**Prayer** – Julia Chambers

**Pledge of Allegiance** – Councilor Garrett – Fire Department Honor Guard

### **Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards**

#### **1 A ceremony for the swearing in and badge pinning for new hires (26-007) [\(10:20\)](#)**

Chief Jeremy Headman recognized the following individuals as newest members of the Provo Fire Department: Bryan Courtney, Trenton Batty, Brandon Byers, and Ricky Fassbinder. After reading a short bio for each employee, Chief invited a family member to pin their badge upon their uniform.

Heidi Allman, City Recorder, administered the oath of office to the group.

#### **Public Comment [\(20:16\)](#)**

Chair MacKay read the public comment preamble and opened the public comment period.

Melanie McCoard, of Provo, expressed concerns regarding the appointment process for City boards and commissions. She referenced materials she had shared illustrating how boards currently operate compared to how they should function. She noted that while the Mayor recommends appointments and the Council has authority to approve or deny them, the Council has rarely declined recent appointments. She encouraged the Council to exercise greater diligence in reviewing appointees to ensure they are knowledgeable and aligned with City policies and plans. Ms. McCoard also shared that she had previously applied for several board and commission positions but was not selected. She stated that she is no longer seeking appointment and has instead created a website, PreserveProvo.com, along with

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

associated social media platforms. She explained that these efforts will be used to share her perspectives, past correspondence with the Council, and to produce podcast content aimed at documenting her institutional knowledge.

Dallin Flake, of Provo, discussed the contract with Flock Safety, raising concerns about surveillance and data privacy. He acknowledged that Mayor Judkins had received feedback from residents and is gathering additional information but emphasized that responsibility for oversight rests with the entire City leadership. Mr. Flake noted increasing public interest and media attention on the issue and encouraged residents to share their concerns to ensure transparency and accountability. He expressed the view that the use of Flock Safety cameras may pose risks to privacy and civil liberties and urged the Council to evaluate whether the contract aligns with community values. He also invited members of the public to connect with him after the meeting or through social media to further discuss the issue.

Aaron Capell, of Clearfield, expressed concerns about the use of Flock Safety technology across Utah cities. Although not a Provo resident, he stated that the issue has statewide implications. Mr. Campbell raised concerns about the company's national database, describing it as a form of widespread surveillance with limited benefit to law enforcement. While expressing support for law enforcement, he emphasized the importance of protecting constitutional rights, specifically referencing concerns related to unreasonable searches and seizures. He commended Provo residents for voicing their concerns and encouraged the Council to take a critical look at the City's contract with Flock Safety.

Chair MacKay closed the public comment period.

### **Action Agenda**

**2        A public hearing to receive input from the public with respect to the issuance of up to \$20,000,000 of transportation sales tax revenue bonds for the purpose of financing construction of the Airport terminal expansion (26-009) [\(27:46\)](#)**

Jimmy McKnight, Public Works Division Director, presented. He provided background on a previously approved resolution authorizing \$20 million in transportation sales tax revenue bonds. He explained that two issues required the item to be returned for further action. First, because the City intends to repay the bonds early using airport revenues, federal tax regulations (IRS requirements) necessitate an additional public hearing. Second, during lender due diligence, concerns were raised about the County's authorization of the sales tax revenues, which were subject to review in 2028. Mr. McKnight reported that the City worked with Utah County to address this concern, resulting in an interlocal agreement approved by the County Commission to maintain the sales tax revenues through the term of the bond. He noted that the purpose of the public hearing was to receive input on the bonds, and that a subsequent agenda item would include reauthorization of the bonds and approval of the interlocal agreement. He also indicated that additional staff and bond counsel were available to answer questions related to the project or financial details.

Chair MacKay opened the public hearing.

Melanie McCoard, of Provo, spoke regarding the history and development of the Provo Regional Airport. She recognized several individuals who contributed to the airport's establishment over many years and expressed concern that their efforts have not been consistently acknowledged in public discussions. Ms. McCoard also outlined her personal involvement in past airport-related issues, including community

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

organizing, advocacy on property impacts, and engagement with regulatory and operational matters. She stated that she has applied multiple times to serve on the Airport Board but has not been selected. She encouraged the Council to appoint individuals who can provide independent perspectives and oversight of airport matters.

With no other comments, Chair MacKay closed the public hearing and invited questions from council.

Councilor Bogdin noted that nearby neighborhoods had representation on the Airport Board, which continued until the previous June. She asked Brian Torgersen whether there are plans to include a neighborhood representative in an upcoming board appointment.

Brian Torgersen, Airport Director, clarified that he does not make appointments to boards but supports neighborhood representation on the Airport Board. He stated that he would recommend such representation to the Mayor, who is responsible for appointments, subject to Council approval.

Councilor Bogdin expressed support for including one or more residents on the Airport Board, specifically noting a preference for representation from areas most directly impacted, such as the Provo Bay and Fort Utah neighborhoods.

Councilor Garrett asked for clarification on the full term of the bond, referencing prior discussion about the City's interest in paying it off early, and inquired whether the term was 15 years.

Mr. McKnight confirmed that the bond term is 15 years and stated that the City's goal is to repay the bonds earlier, within approximately seven to eight years.

Chair MacKay proceeded to the next agenda item.

**3 A resolution approving the issuance of transportation sales tax revenue bonds, and the execution and delivery of an interlocal agreement with Utah County. (26-009) [\(34:55\)](#)**

**Motion:** An implied motion to approve Resolution 2026-4, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

As the presentation had been provided with the previous item, Chair MacKay opened the public comment period. With no comments received, she closed the public comment and invited a council discussion.

Councilor Bogdin asked for clarification on the trade-offs associated with allocating transportation sales tax funds to the airport. She noted that she had received questions from the public and requested an explanation of what the City may be foregoing by using these funds for the airport instead of other transportation-related purposes.

Mr. McKnight explained that the quarter cent transportation sales tax being used for the airport is one of several funding sources available for transportation related projects, including roads, sidewalks, and airports. He noted that by allocating these funds to the airport, the City is forgoing the opportunity to use them for other transportation needs. However, he emphasized that the City has additional funding sources such as the fifth cent sales tax, transportation utility fees, and Class B and C road funds available to continue supporting other transportation projects.

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Councilor Bogdin referenced information in the meeting materials indicating that the County Commission plans to continue the transportation sales tax beyond the previously scheduled 2028 review due to the importance of the airport. She asked for confirmation that the County would delay reevaluating the tax until after the City's bond obligations for the airport are repaid and suggested that this commitment may reduce concerns about long term tradeoffs.

Mr. McKnight confirmed that the County Commission intends to continue the tax and clarified that the existing code only required a review in 2028, not termination. He explained that, to address uncertainty for potential bond purchasers, the County agreed through the interlocal agreement to commit to maintaining the tax rather than discontinuing it.

Chair MacKay asked for clarification on whether the transportation sales tax funds are specific to Provo or allocated by the County.

Mr. McKnight clarified that the funds in question are Provo's portion and have been consistently received by the City since 2019.

Chair MacKay called for a vote on the implied motion.

**Vote:** The motion passed 6:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor. Councilor Hoban excused.

**4 A resolution to place a 2.952 acre parcel of ground located at 351 West Center Street on the surplus property list. (26-012) [\(38:36\)](#)**

**Motion:** An implied motion to approve Resolution 2026-5, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Tara Riddle, Property Manager, presented. She explained that the property under discussion is the former City Center block located at 351 West Center, consisting of just under three acres. She noted that the property was appraised twice, with a combined value of approximately \$6.8 million. She stated that a request for proposals has been issued for redevelopment of the site and that placing the property on the surplus property list is a required step to move forward with the redevelopment process.

Councilor Bogdin asked whether placing the property on the surplus list would obligate the City to accept a proposal received through the request for proposals process, particularly if the Council is not satisfied with the submissions.

Ms. Riddle clarified that placing the property on the surplus list does not oblige the City to accept any proposals received. She explained that the designation simply indicates the property is available for sale and is a required step in the process. She noted that the City retains full discretion and may remove the property from the surplus list at any time if desired.

Councilor Bogdin sought clarification on the Council's authority in the RFP process, asking whether, if staff selects a proposal through the administrative process, the Council retains the ability to reject that proposal and choose not to proceed.

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Chair MacKay confirmed that nothing can move forward unless it is brought back to the council to vote.

Chair MacKay opened public comment. With none, and no further council discussion, she called for a vote.

**Vote:** The motion passed 6:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor. Councilor Hoban excused.

**5 An ordinance amending the zone map classification of real property, generally located at 1560 South 1100 West, from the A1.5 and RA zones to the General Commercial (CG) and Very Low Density (VLDR) zones. Lakewood Neighborhood. (PLRZ20250028) [\(41:18\)](#)**

**Motion:** An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2026-6, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Aaron Ardmore, Planning Supervisor, provided an overview of the property and proposed zoning changes. He explained the location of the site in relation to Lakeview Parkway and nearby roads, and described the surrounding land use designations, including residential, mixed use, and open space. He stated that the proposal would rezone the majority of the property to General Commercial, with a smaller portion designated for Very Low Density Residential use. He also noted that the application has been reviewed by staff and the Planning Commission, and that a conceptual plan was submitted as part of the proposal.

Chair MacKay opened public comment.

Teri Jerman, a Provo resident whose property is adjacent to the subject site, spoke in support of the small proposed commercial designation. She noted that a portion of her property had previously been acquired by the City for construction of Lakeview Parkway. While she supports the current plan for limited commercial use, she encouraged the Council to be mindful of expanding the commercial area if development proves successful and appropriate given the surrounding roadway infrastructure.

Chair MacKay closed public comment and invited a council discussion.

Councilor Bogdin expressed opposition to the proposed zoning plan, noting concerns previously raised during the work meeting. She stated that the proposal designates the area as general commercial rather than neighborhood commercial, which she believes is more appropriate given the surrounding context. She also noted that nearby commercial areas, such as East Bay, already provide amenities, and questioned whether the location would effectively serve surrounding neighborhoods. Councilor Bogdin raised additional concerns about the lack of appropriate transitions between residential and commercial uses, including insufficient buffering and alignment with adjacent properties. She also referenced City policies regarding driveway access on collector roads and suggested the residential component should be better integrated into the overall plan. She indicated a preference for an alternative zoning approach and concluded that she would not support the proposal in its current form.

Chair MacKay invited the developer to share any thoughts.

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Andrade Christensen, the applicant, stated that efforts have been made to align the proposal with community needs and feedback. He indicated that the vision for the site includes uses such as a convenience store, gas station, and restaurant, noting some preliminary interest from potential tenants. He explained that site constraints and surrounding roadway configurations influenced the layout, including a transition from a larger collector road near the sports park to smaller neighborhood roads. Mr. Christensen stated that the proposal is consistent with the general plan and intended to complement planned residential development in the area, which includes approximately 260 housing units across a larger 57-acre project. He expressed a desire to create a development that fits well within the community.

Councilor Garrett referenced the suggestion to consider an SC-1 zoning designation and asked whether that zoning would accommodate the applicant's proposed uses, including a gas station. He further inquired whether any elements of the project would not be permitted under an SC-1 zone compared to the proposed general commercial (CG) zoning.

Aaron Ardmore explained that a gas station is permitted by right in the general commercial (CG) zone but would be a conditional use in the SC-1 zone. He noted that many retail and restaurant uses are allowed in both zones and are generally similar. In response to a follow-up question from Councilor Garrett regarding specific differences, including whether a hotel would be permitted, Mr. Ardmore stated that he would review the zoning comparisons and provide additional information.

Councilor Whitlock requested additional details regarding the residential component of the proposal. He acknowledged the general concept for commercial uses on the site and asked the applicant to elaborate on the housing portion, including the type of units, whether they would be rental or owner occupied, and how the development would be managed.

Mr. Christensen stated that all proposed housing units would be for sale rather than rental. He noted that the development is intended to align with the City's plans and agreements and described the project as a livable community with a range of home sizes. He explained that offering both smaller and larger homes would allow residents to remain within the same neighborhood over time, supporting long term stability and community cohesion.

Chair MacKay expressed appreciation for the clarification that the applicant owns additional surrounding property, noting that this provides a more comprehensive approach to planning the area. She indicated that considering the broader development as a whole, rather than a single parcel, would be beneficial in determining the best use of the site.

Mr. Ardmore provided examples of uses permitted in the general commercial (CG) zone that are not allowed in the SC-1 zone, including hotels, garden supply stores, larger retail uses, and gyms or athletic clubs. He also noted that the CG zone allows certain conditional auto-related uses that are not permitted in the SC-1 zone.

Councilor Bogdin asked about the possibility of changing the General Commercial zone to an SC1 zone.

Mr. Christensen indicated he is open to either zoning option, provided it accommodates the intended uses such as a gas station, restaurants, and community serving amenities. He stated that maintaining flexibility for those uses is important to the project.

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Chair MacKay clarified that both zoning options would allow a gas station and restaurants, but the SC-1 zone would exclude uses such as hotels, which had been a concern raised by Councilor Bogdin.

Mr. Christensen responded that he understood the need for hotels in the area but agreed that such a use could be more appropriate in a different location.

Councilor Bogdin raised concerns about the proposed layout of the Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) portion, specifically questioning whether it could be better integrated into the overall development with rear loaded access to avoid driveways on 1560 South.

Mr. Christensen responded that due to the shape and size constraints of the parcel, particularly near an adjacent property, it would be difficult to provide residential access from within the neighborhood. He explained that accessing the units from the commercial side was not desirable and that the current layout was intended to create a buffer between commercial and residential uses.

Councilor Bogdin acknowledged the intent to create a buffer but reiterated concerns about allowing driveways on collector roads, emphasizing that 1560 South is a heavily traveled corridor serving schools, a church, and surrounding neighborhoods. She expressed a preference for limiting direct driveway access in favor of consolidated entrances and raised additional concerns about insufficient buffering and transitions between differing residential densities. She also noted potential parking and traffic issues in the area, particularly given nearby institutional uses.

Councilor Whipple expressed strong support for the proposal, highlighting the value of creating neighborhood scale commercial areas that serve surrounding residential communities. She noted that the inclusion of restaurants and grocery type uses would be appropriate for the area and beneficial to nearby residents, as well as supportive of activity at the sports park along Lakeview Parkway. She also indicated support for the potential inclusion of a hotel, citing a broader shortage of hotel rooms in the city and region, particularly during large events. Councilor Whipple stated that the proposed layout, with more intensive uses along the parkway and neighborhood-oriented development closer to residential areas, was well considered. She further expressed appreciation for the inclusion of varied housing types, noting that the transition in density would create a desirable and livable community. She commended the applicant for taking a comprehensive approach to development that contributes to a functional and sustainable community.

Chair MacKay expressed strong support for the proposal, noting that the applicant's ownership of the surrounding property provides confidence in a cohesive and well-planned development. She stated that the for-sale housing component is a positive aspect and contributes to creating a desirable place to live. She also shared her experience living near neighborhood commercial uses, noting that proximity to small scale retail can enhance quality of life and serve as a central gathering point for the community.

Councilor Christensen indicated a preference for the SC1 zoning designation, noting that it would better support neighborhood oriented commercial uses.

Councilor Garrett expressed support for the developer's intent to develop the parcel and acknowledged the need for commercial uses along Lakeview Parkway. He noted that a nearby parcel is already zoned general commercial and could accommodate more intensive uses, such as a hotel. He suggested that rezoning this parcel to SC-1 could provide a better transition between that site and the adjacent

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

residential neighborhood. Councilor Garrett indicated support for the project and encouraged the developer to return with a revised proposal reflecting SC-1 zoning.

**Motion:** Councilor Whitlock made a motion to change the rezone designation from CG to SC.1. Councilor Christensen seconded the motion.

Chair MacKay called for discussion on the substitute motion. With none, she called for a vote.

**Vote:** The motion passed 5:1 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, MacKay, and Whitlock in favor. Councilor Whipple opposed and Councilor Hoban excused.

\*\*The Council proceeded to Item 6 while staff revised the ordinance language.

Chair MacKay reread the item with the updated language. She then called for a vote.

**Vote:** The motion passed 6:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, MacKay, Whitlock, and Whipple in favor. Councilor Hoban excused.

**6 An ordinance amending the zone map classification of approximately 39 acres of real property, generally located at 2255 N University Parkway from the RC and SC2 zones to the VLDR, LDR, MDR, and SC3 zones. Carterville Neighborhood (PLRZ20250689) (1:05:00)**

**Motion:** An implied motion to approve an Ordinance, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Jessica Dahneke, City Planner, presented the proposed rezone for the 2230 North Station Area Plan. She explained that the station area plans were adopted in September, and this step ensures that current zoning aligns with the adopted future land use plan. She described the planning approach as concentrating higher density and more intense uses near the station, with a gradual transition to lower density residential areas to better integrate with existing neighborhoods. Ms. Dahneke outlined the proposed zoning, including rezoning the Walmart area to allow for commercial mixed use and applying a range of residential zones with decreasing density moving outward. She summarized feedback from the Planning Commission, which included concerns about traffic impacts and the need for open space, as well as general support for the rezone. She noted the Commission recommended approval but suggested the Council consider adjusting boundary lines to avoid placing significantly different densities directly across from each other. She also clarified that while changes to the overall station area plan would require recertification with the state, adjustments to zoning boundaries may be made without that step, as long as they remain consistent with the adopted land use designations.

Chair MacKay asked for clarification on what types of zoning changes could be made without requiring state recertification of the station area plan.

Ms. Dahneke explained that adjusting zoning within the bounds of the adopted land use, such as shifting from MDR to LDR where similar housing types are allowed, would not require returning to the state. However, more significant changes, such as moving to single family only development that does not align with the planned land use, would likely require recertification. She also noted uncertainty about the timeline for such a process, as it has not yet been done.

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Councilor Bogdin asked about the implications of not approving the proposed rezone.

Ms. Dahneke explained that aligning zoning with the adopted station area plan is a requirement tied to the state process coordinated through MAG (Mountainland Association of Governments). She noted that failure to comply could result in the City losing eligibility for certain transportation funding. While she did not have specific dollar amounts, she indicated that funding impacts would be related to transportation resources.

Councilor Whitlock asked clarifying questions to help the public understand the requirements and implications of the station area rezone process.

Ms. Dahneke confirmed that state law required the City to adopt station area plans for UVX corridors, that those plans have already been approved by the state, and that the City must now update zoning to align with those plans. She noted the target timeline for completing the rezonings is December 31, 2025, with some flexibility as the City continues to work through the process.

Councilor Whitlock also asked about the practical impact of the rezonings.

Ms. Dahneke explained that the intent is to guide future redevelopment, though there are currently no major development proposals anticipated in the area, and changes will likely occur gradually based on market conditions.

Councilor Whitlock inquired about potential challenges if future development proposals do not align with the adopted plan.

Ms. Dahneke explained that significant deviations would likely require the City to return to the state for recertification of the plan, though there is limited precedent for that process. She added that staff would first work with developers to align projects with the adopted zoning and land use framework before pursuing plan amendments.

Councilor Whipple expressed reservations about the Planning Commission's recommendation to adjust zoning boundaries mid-block. She stated that using streets as boundary lines provides clearer and more consistent divisions, whereas mid-block changes could create irregular parcel configurations. She noted that differing zones will adjoin regardless of boundary placement and did not believe the proposed adjustments would meaningfully improve neighborhood impacts. Given the area's recent development and limited likelihood of near-term changes, she indicated she does not support modifying the proposed zoning boundaries.

Chair MacKay opened public comment. With none, she closed public comment and invited a council discussion.

Councilor Bogdin expressed uncertainty about the appropriateness of medium density residential zoning along the river corridor, noting that upcoming river planning efforts may provide additional insight. She suggested that while the City may need to proceed with the current rezone, it would be beneficial to revisit the area in the future to determine whether the zoning remains aligned with long term goals for the corridor.

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Councilor Whipple noted that existing regulations, including a 100-foot setback requirement, already provide protection for development near the river regardless of zoning. She expressed that the proposed rezone would not change those standards and asked whether adopting the zoning would still allow for a future overlay zone to address river corridor protections. She suggested that an overlay could be an effective tool to add additional safeguards while remaining consistent with the adopted plan.

Councilor Whitlock noted that the existing 100-foot river setback would likely limit redevelopment of the parcel in question. He stated that, based on prior discussion, the property may already fall largely within that setback area, making redevelopment unlikely in the near term due to practical and economic constraints.

Chair MacKay stated she would be voting in opposition to the item, citing concerns with state preemption. She expressed that the requirement to rezone limits the City's ability to negotiate specific outcomes during the development process and reduces local control. She then called for a vote on the motion.

**Vote:** The motion failed 3:3 with Councilors Garrett, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor. Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, and MacKay opposed. Councilor Hoban excused.

\*\*The Council returned to Item 5 to vote on the revised ordinance language.

*With no objections, the Provo Municipal Council adjourned and reconvened as the Redevelopment Agency Governing Board of Provo City with Vice-Chair MacKay conducting.*

### **Redevelopment Agency of Provo**

#### **7 A resolution of the Redevelopment Agency of Provo City approving the project area plan for the Lakeview Parkway Community Reinvestment Area (26-005) [\(1:22:01\)](#)**

**Motion:** An implied motion to approve Resolution 2026-RDA-02-10-1, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Melissa McNalley, Redevelopment Director, presented. She explained that the purpose of the plan is to incentivize commercial development in targeted areas, including parcels near the University Avenue interchange and a site south of the Epic Sports Park. Ms. McNalley noted that these properties are already zoned for commercial use, and the plan would provide tools to encourage development. She explained that incentives are needed due to the significant infrastructure requirements and costs associated with preparing the sites, including work related to floodplain conditions. She added that the plan aligns with the City's general plan, economic development goals, and ongoing investments in the sports park and airport expansion.

Vice-Chair MacKay sought confirmation that approving the Community Reinvestment Area plan does not commit the RDA to any specific development or incentive. She clarified that any future incentives or project details would still require separate approval.

Ms. McNalley confirmed that any incentives would be project specific and would require formal approval by the Council and the Redevelopment Agency board. She clarified that the resolution simply

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

establishes a tool that allows the City to consider incentives in the future and does not create any binding commitments.

Board Member Whitlock asked for clarification that the specific details of any future incentives, such as duration and terms, would be established through separate proposals.

Ms. McNalley confirmed that the resolution creates only the framework for potential incentives. She explained that the plan outlines an intent to consider post-performance tax incentives, meaning incentives would be provided after agreed upon development outcomes are achieved. She also noted that this language is included to set expectations and clarify that property tax incentives are not anticipated.

Board Member Bogdin expressed concern that moving forward with the Community Reinvestment Area plan may be premature given the City's ongoing Economic Development Study. She suggested that the City has shifted its approach and that it may be more appropriate to wait for the study results before identifying areas for incentives. She asked whether the item is time sensitive and indicated a preference to revisit the plan after the study is completed to ensure alignment with broader economic development priorities.

Brian Jones, City Attorney, generally agreed that the Board and Council could wait for the Economic Development Study before proceeding, but noted an important exception. He explained that if a specific development proposal seeking incentives comes forward before the study is complete, the City would need to have the Community Reinvestment Area established in order to offer those incentives.

Vice-Chair MacKay opened public comment.

Jason Largever, a Salt Lake City resident and licensed real estate agent, spoke on behalf of property owners along the Lakeview Parkway corridor. He emphasized the importance of incentives as a tool to attract outside investment and support economic growth in the area. He encouraged the Council to consider how the timing of establishing incentive frameworks may impact the City's ability to recruit development and generate tax revenue.

Vice-Chair MacKay closed public comment and invited a board discussion. She expressed strong support for the proposal, emphasizing the City's intentional investment in the sports park as an economic driver. She noted that complementary uses such as hotels, restaurants, and retail are essential to maximize the success of that investment, particularly in conjunction with the airport. She indicated that establishing the framework for incentives is time sensitive and necessary to attract development that supports tourism and economic activity. Drawing on personal experience, she highlighted the spending potential associated with tournaments and events and stated her intent to support the item.

Chair Christensen expressed support for the proposal, stating that it aligns with the City's broader economic development strategy. He noted that significant investments have already been made in the airport and sports park, and that this plan helps leverage those investments by encouraging complementary development. He added that the proposal would help generate additional revenue and provide amenities for both visitors and west side residents and indicated his intent to vote in favor.

Board Member Whitlock expressed support for the proposal, describing it as a flexible and reversible decision that preserves the City's ability to offer incentives in the future without committing to specific

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

actions today. He indicated that this approach does not present significant risk and allows the RDA and Council to evaluate opportunities as they arise. He also emphasized the importance of supporting the success of the sports park, noting the City's existing investment, and stated that additional tools may be necessary to fully realize its potential. Board Member Whitlock added that tax increment financing could be a valuable tool for broader applications, including potentially addressing housing challenges, and expressed interest in gaining experience with its use.

Board Member Whipple expressed support for moving forward with the proposal, noting that while a larger project area could have provided broader flexibility for funding, she understands the decision to focus on a smaller area in response to community feedback. She acknowledged that the narrower scope may be more limited but indicated her support for proceeding with the plan.

Vice-Chair MacKay called for a vote.

**Vote:** The motion passed 5:1 with Board Members Christensen, Garrett, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor. Board Member Bogdin opposed and Board Member Hoban excused.

**8        \*\*\*CANCELLED\*\*\* A resolution approving the redevelopment agency of Provo City to adopt a project area budget for the Lakeview Parkway Community Reinvestment Area (26-005)**

*With no objections, the Redevelopment Agency Governing Board of Provo City adjourned and reconvened as the Provo Municipal Council with Chair MacKay conducting.*

**Action Agenda**

**9        An ordinance approving the Lakeview Parkway Community Reinvestment Project Area Plan. (25-005) [\(1:34:38\)](#)**

**Motion:** An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2026-8, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Mr. Jones explained that state law requires approval from both the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) board and the Municipal Council because they are legally separate entities. He noted that while the dual approval process may seem redundant, it is necessary to meet legal requirements.

Chair MacKay opened item for public comment. With none, and no council discussion, she called for a vote.

**Vote:** The motion passed 6:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor. Councilor Hoban excused.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 7:00 PM.

These minutes were approved by unanimous consent on the 12th day of May, 2026.

X



---

Heidi Allen  
City Recorder