COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT AGENCY OF MAGNA MEETING MINUTES
January 27, 2026

Webster Center
8952 West Magna Main Street
Magna, Utah 84044

Board Members Present: Terry George, Michael Jensen, Audrey Pierce, Mick Sudbury, Steve Propokis and Megan Olsen

Other Staff Present: Dan Torres, David Brickey, Diana Baun, Adam Long

1. **CALL TO ORDER @ 5:30 pm**
2. **DETERMINE QUORUM**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENTS** - *None*
4. **CONSENT ITEMS**
   a. Approval of the December 9, 2025 CRA Meeting Minutes

Board Member Prokopis moved to approve the December 9, 2025 Magna CRA Meeting Minutes as published. Board Member Jensen seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

5. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**
   a. Draft Project Area Plan for the Proposed Broadway Community Reinvestment Project Area

Dan Torres presented a draft project area plan for the proposed Broadway Community Reinvestment Project Area before the board. He explained that, as the city and CRA board considered the purchase of the church property on Broadway Street, staff believed it would be beneficial to establish a district. He stated that the district would function as a tax financing project area, although staff did not anticipate using property tax increment depreciation in this instance. Instead, the primary purpose of creating the district was to give the CRA board greater flexibility to later dispose of the property than the municipality itself would have under normal municipal restrictions. Mr. Torres referenced paperwork in the meeting packet, which contained a map showing both the church property parcel and an adjacent parcel owned by Salt Lake County that had reportedly been an unused stormwater detention pond never incorporated into the county's system. He stated that the city had reached out to Salt Lake County to determine whether the county would transfer ownership of that parcel to Magna City or the CRA board.

Adam Long, serving as redevelopment agency attorney, provided additional legal context regarding the creation of the project area. Mr. Long explained that the purpose of the meeting was to designate a project area because the Community Reinvestment Agency's authority to hold property, dispose of property, encourage development, and enter agreements was generally limited to areas formally designated as project areas. He stated that the project area plan was largely a statutory compliance document that outlined the agency's general expectations and did not impose binding restrictions on future agency actions. Adam Long explained that the process required a public hearing with notices posted online and mailed to property owners within the proposed project area, taxing entities, and other agencies as required by statute. Adam Long further explained that, following the public hearing, the

CRA board could consider a resolution to establish the project area, while the City Council would separately consider an ordinance as the second part of the creation process.

Board Member Steve Prokopis asked for clarification regarding the governing board of the CRA. Adam Long confirmed that the City Council itself served as the CRA governing board under state statute, explaining that council members effectively acted in dual roles by switching from their council responsibilities to their CRA board responsibilities during such meetings.

Board Member Michael Jensen asked for clarification regarding how the CRA's authority made property disposal "easier." Adam Long explained that redevelopment agencies functioned as a municipality's primary economic development tool and possessed broader authority than cities themselves regarding property transactions. Mr. Long stated that municipalities disposing of surplus property were generally required to maximize value and obtain fair market compensation through processes such as auctions or listings. In contrast, he explained that redevelopment agencies had flexibility to sell or contribute property below market value if doing so supported a particularly desirable development project or incentivized economic activity. He stated that agencies throughout Utah frequently used such authority to encourage specific types of development that cities could not otherwise facilitate directly.

Board Member Michael Jensen also asked whether Salt Lake County was comfortable with the inclusion of county-owned property within the proposed project area. Dan Torres responded that staff had contacted Lori Stringham, who served on the Municipal Services District board as the county council representative, and had discussed the property during earlier conversations in the summer. Mr. Torres stated that the city had not yet received a formal response from the county, though staff had heard there had been some movement within the mayor's office. He explained that staff included the county parcel within the proposed project area because the city was actively working toward a possible transfer or future coordination. Adam Long added that merely including the county property within the project area imposed no obligations or negative impacts on Salt Lake County and did not commit the county to any action. Mr. Long further stated that, absent objections during the public hearing, staff assumed the county was not opposed to the inclusion.

Board Member Jensen moved to open the public hearing for draft project area plan noted above. Board Member Prokopis seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

Roberta Nichols, a Magna resident who stated she had lived across from the church property for more than 70 years, asked whether the property was properly zoned for the proposed use. She explained that they believed the area had previously been restricted to single-dwelling residential zoning and noted that they had not been allowed to build a duplex on their own property. She also stated they had not been aware of any zoning change affecting the property.

Dan Torres responded that, one or two months earlier, the City Council had rezoned all church properties and public facility properties throughout Magna as public facilities zoning. He explained that this included properties such as substations, Magna Water facilities, and church-owned properties. He stated that the Broadway church property was currently zoned for public uses and not for residential housing or other residential development. He further explained that if a different use were proposed in the future, the matter would need to proceed through the city's land use process, including review by the Planning Commission and consideration of a zoning change. Mayor Mick Sudbury added that any such zoning change would also return to the City Council for consideration.

Board Member Terry George asked whether the rezoning had occurred through an ordinance process.

Dan Torres responded that, to the best of staff's knowledge, all required public noticing procedures had been followed, including mailings to adjacent property owners. Mr. Torres stated that staff could review the records to confirm the timing and noticing details because the rezoning had occurred citywide. Board Member Steve Prokopis clarified that the ordinance had not targeted a specific parcel, but instead applied broadly to all public utility properties and church properties within Magna, which may have caused some residents to overlook the significance of the change for the Broadway property specifically.

Board Member Terry George stated that the ordinance had been intended to protect community properties from large-scale residential developers by ensuring that the City Council retained authority over future land use decisions in the area. Board Member Terry George referenced development concerns related to Little Valley Gateway and explained that any future zoning changes would require council approval.

Dan Torres stated that the rezoning had occurred on November 18 and provided additional background regarding the city's decision. He explained that the LDS Church had been disposing of properties throughout Utah and that many church-owned parcels in Magna and Kearns had previously been zoned residential. According to Mr. Torres, developers had shown significant interest in using those properties for medium-density and high-density residential projects. He stated that Kearns, as another Municipal Services District member community, had proactively rezoned similar properties as public facilities to prevent high-density residential developments from occurring by right. He explained that Magna adopted a similar approach so the City Council and the public would have greater control and oversight regarding any future proposed developments on former church properties. The rezoning was intended as a proactive measure to prevent developers from automatically obtaining vested rights for medium-density or high-density residential projects within established neighborhoods.

Board Member Jensen moved to close the public hearing. Board Member Prokopis seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

6. **DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**
   a. Discussion and Possible Action on **Resolution R2026-01**, Draft Project Area Plan for the Proposed Broadway Community Reinvestment Project Area

Board Member Jensen moved to approve Resolution R2026-01, Approving the draft project area plan for the proposed Broadway Community Reinvestment Project Area. Board Member Olsen seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

   b. Discussion Regarding Recent Updates

David Brickey provided a legislative update regarding Community Reinvestment Agencies during the current legislative session. He stated that staff had asked the city's two lobbyists to monitor and report on any proposed legislation that could impact CRAs moving forward. He explained that several state senators had expressed opposition to Community Reinvestment Agencies and that discussions were taking place regarding potential limitations on CRAs in the future. Mr. Brickey stated that staff would continue monitoring the legislative session and keep the council informed regarding any developments. He also noted that the legislative session was scheduled to conclude on March 6 and described the process as a long marathon.

Board Member Michael Jensen requested additional information regarding the city's two redevelopment project areas, which he referred to as RDAs. Board Member Jensen asked Dan Torres to provide maps and zoning information for all parcels within the Magna Main Street redevelopment area, including parcels extending across the street toward 8400 West and properties near Kennecott-owned land. He stated that reviewing the zoning classifications, including commercial, residential, and retail designations, would help the council begin developing a broader plan for future projects and redevelopment activities within the area. He also asked how far west the redevelopment area extended and questioned whether it crossed beyond 9200 West near the former driving range property.

Dan Torres responded that he did not believe the redevelopment area extended beyond that point but stated he would verify the boundaries and provide maps. Board Member Jensen then asked whether the property west of 9200 West was currently zoned agricultural. Mr. Torres confirmed that it was. Board Member Steve Prokopis asked whether the driving range property remained owned by Kennecott or whether it belonged to the school district. Board Member Jensen stated that he believed the property remained privately owned.

Dan Torres asked whether Board Member Jensen needed any additional information besides the maps and zoning details. Board Member Jensen responded by asking for updated information regarding available redevelopment funds, particularly affordable housing funds associated with the project areas. Michael Jensen stated that he believed approximately $2 million remained in one of the redevelopment areas and asked how much of that amount was allocated specifically for affordable housing purposes.

Dan Torres explained that, since the CRA's formation, the City Manager had served as Executive Director and that staff had been working through files inherited from Salt Lake County to better understand the status of the redevelopment areas and any remaining obligations. Mr. Torres acknowledged that significant investigation was still underway regarding existing agreements, outstanding obligations, and declining revenue trends within the redevelopment areas. He stated that staff had contacted Salt Lake County to obtain additional information and had also reached out to the county's Office of Regional Development to better understand the financial structure and obligations tied to the redevelopment districts. Staff would prioritize compiling the requested information but would need additional time to fully uncover and organize the records.

David Brickey added that Arbor Park was expected to generate additional payouts during the year because several new businesses had recently opened within the project area. He explained that these new businesses would now qualify to draw increment funds that had not previously been distributed.

Board Member Michael Jensen then discussed a potential future proposal related to affordable housing funds within the redevelopment districts. He stated that he wanted information regarding the amount of affordable housing money available because he was considering proposing a program to assist what he described as "essential professionals," including younger police officers, firefighters, nurses, and school teachers. He explained that the idea would involve using affordable housing funds to assist with down payments for qualifying individuals while including deed restrictions requiring repayment of the assistance if the property were later sold. Any equity appreciation beyond the assistance amount could remain with the homeowner. He further explained that the goal would be to encourage essential workers to establish long-term roots in Magna as they advanced in their careers. He also stated that the city would need updated information regarding the countywide 80% area median income thresholds in order to structure such a program appropriately.

Board Member Steve Prokopis asked for clarification regarding whether the remaining redevelopment funds represented leftover money after full project buildout and completion of all increment payments. Board Member Jensen explained that the redevelopment funds included separate allocations, including a required 20% set-aside specifically dedicated to affordable housing purposes, and that this affordable housing allocation would be the funding source considered for the proposed essential professionals program. Board Member Jensen stated that many cities currently had affordable housing funds sitting unused and suggested that using those funds to support entry-level essential workers could strengthen long-term community stability in Magna.

Board Member Megan Olsen commented that the proposal resembled how Utah Housing Corporation originally operated. Board Member Steve Prokopis asked whether the affordable housing funds were required to remain within the CRA boundaries. Michael Jensen responded that the city could potentially enter agreements with another redevelopment agency to use funds elsewhere, provided the money was ultimately spent for affordable housing purposes.

Board Member Audrey Pierce requested that, as staff compiled redevelopment information, they also include timelines and historical background related to the transfer of redevelopment functions from Salt Lake County to Magna City. She stated that only a few current council members remained from the period when those transitions and discussions originally occurred, and that providing timelines regarding district formation, payouts, and district termination dates would help newer members better understand the history and obligations associated with the redevelopment areas. Dan Torres agreed and stated that staff could provide a brief history and summary of the formation and obligations of the districts, including information regarding area median income requirements and affordable housing obligations tied to the original formation documents. Mayor Mick Sudbury acknowledged the discussion, and Audrey Pierce noted that the Magna Main Street redevelopment area was significantly newer than the downtown redevelopment district.

7. **CLOSED SESSIONS AS NEEDED PURSUANT TO UTAH STAE CODE §52-4-205**
   a. Discussion of the Character, Professional Competence or Physical or Mental Health of an Individual.
   b. Strategy Sessions to Discuss Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation.
   c. Strategy Sessions to Discuss the Purchase, Exchange, or Lease of Real Property.
   d. Discussion Regarding Deployment of Security Personnel, Devices, or Systems; and Other Lawful Purposes as Listed in Utah Code §52-4-205

8. **ADJOURN**

Board Member Jensen moved to adjourn the January 27, 2026 Magna City Community Reinvestment Agency Meeting. Board Member George seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

This is a true and correct copy of the January 27, 2025 CRA Meeting Minutes, which were approved on June 9, 2026.

Attest:

Diana Baun
Diana Baun, Secretary

Mick Sudbury, Board Chair