

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

The Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) of Salt Lake City, Utah, met on Tuesday, August 20, 2019 in Room 326, Committee Room, City County Building, 451 South State.

In Attendance: Directors Erin Mendenhall, Amy Fowler, Charlie Luke, Chris Wharton, Analia Valdemoros, James Rogers, and Andrew Johnston.

Staff in Attendance: Cindy Gust Jenson, Council Executive Director; Jennifer Bruno, Council Executive Deputy Director; David Litvack, Mayor's Deputy Chief of Staff; Patrick Leary, Mayor's Chief of Staff; Rusty Vetter, Deputy City Attorney; Danny Walz, RDA Chief Operating Officer; Jill Wilkerson-Smith, RDA Deputy Chief Operating Officer; Katherine Lewis, Senior City Attorney; Kort Utley, RDA Senior Project Manager; Tammy Hunsaker, RDA Project Manager; Susan Lundmark, RDA Project Manager; Tracy Tran, RDA Project Manager; Corinne Piazza, RDA Project Manager; Lehua Weaver, Council Associate Deputy Director; Benjamin Luedtke, Council Public Policy Analyst; Allison Rowland, Council Public Policy Analyst; Nick Tarbet, Council Senior Public Policy Analyst; Scott Crandall, Deputy City Recorder; and Cindi Mansell, City Recorder.

Director Fowler presided at and conducted the meeting.

The meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m.

A. 2:05:30 PM GENERAL COMMENTS TO THE BOARD

The following individuals spoke in opposition of the NWQ LLC Tax Increment Agreement: **Maurena Grossman, Bob Brister, Freeman Stevenson, Thomas Walker, Deeda Seed, Amelia Niumeitolu, Ti Tavai, Ursula Jochmann, Ty Markham, Dean Dinas, Meeshelle McKee, Adair Kovac, Katie Pappas, Gerald McDonough, Heather Dove, Georgie Corkery, Larry Dean, Alan Ernstsen, Joel Ban, Kathleen Cahill, Robert Broadhead, Bearly Noticeable, Blake Quinton, Pamela Starley, Lee Stanhope, Monica Hilding, Jesse Cox, Caleb Fralick, Ashley Kinser, Thea Brannon, Michelle Page, Carl Moore, Susan Corth, Michael Budig, Andrew Harding, Dorothy Owen, Jill Merritt, Soren Simonson, Jane Larson, Jonathan Bogart, Rocky Derrick, Tracey Bushman, Richard Kanner M. D., Ray Wheeler, Sylvia Wilcox, Shawna South, Kathy Wilson, Micah Schow, Sarah Buck, Elizabeth Wilcox, Ethan Murdock, Cherise Udell, James Miska, and Paul Dalrymple.**

Public Comments included: not spending tax dollars on this project; concerns with environmental impacts on Salt Lake City and the State of Utah; project being a direct threat to basic human needs such as air, safety, traffic; Salt Lake City residents caring about clean air; residents appalled the City would want to subsidize development of a project that would add more air pollution; asking the Board to listen to their conscience and public opinion; air already shockingly polluted;

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

people enduring respiratory ailments due to pollution; environmental issues; premature to earmark money for development when there were serious questions that needed to be addressed and resolved before any commitment of funding or tax dollars; Master Development and Reimbursement Agreement approved January 16, 2018 when very few understood what it was or even what the Inland Port was at that time; consider scenarios and strategies to reduce the effects of the Inland Port; these areas become dirty polluting districts that offer low paid employment; no answers provided what this mega warehouse development would do to the environment or how it would impact neighboring communities; climate change; families not in a condition to allocate \$28 million for a destructive condition; many tribal leaders not being informed the Inland Port would be on their land; comparison to the Los Angeles County Inland Port area; concerns regarding lung cancer caused by worsening air conditions; increasing inversions; and need to reduce pollution and heavy truck traffic (not increase).

Further comments in opposition included: review and comments about the bias of the third-party economic impact analysis; number of jobs created being inflated and actually being 200% fewer jobs than stated; wages being overstated; retaining workers being a major problem as these types of jobs are not desirable; encourage new third-party study; difficulties to senior citizens or others with asthma; area rezoned to become an Inland Port; prison already having issues because the land was not suitable and over budget; Gunnison Island being the number one breeding habitat in the world for Pelicans and potential impacts to other valuable ecosystems; caution about negotiating with the State Legislature because they break promises (like with Legacy Highway); thinking about the future; people moving here to enjoy cleaner air and a better quality of life; development would come without City assistance; environmental safeguards being promulgated and enforced for new development; subcontractors of the development to follow environmental quality obligations; setting precedence; entire process being disrespectful; no people of color on the City Council yet they are making choices for them - without regard to safety, life, or future implications; State took control over that area but the City still had the power to oppose the Colmena development and consider other options; this project being the result of failure of leadership of State and City government; the entire Inland Port area being forced on citizens and carried out by only those who care about economic development regardless of negative effects on people/land/ecosystems.

Further comments included: Council not seriously listening/ignoring/ misrepresenting its constituents; against approval of tax subsidy to any private entity without financial analysis; bird species threatened by the Inland Port development; "F" air pollution/air quality grade given by the American Lung Association; Salt Lake City

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

elected officials continually mentioning the importance of clean air - yet contradicting themselves with this proposed agreement/tax incentives/kicking off the polluting port; all information being speculative with no known facts as to effects; why would this Inland Port be any different than the one in Los Angeles or Illinois (both outstanding examples of how things go wrong); waiting for pending Inland Port litigation outcome before promulgating development; understanding of any benefits associated with the Inland Port; solar panels appear like water to birds; building a place for warehouses, diesel, trucks, planes, trains, and bodies of dead birds; the proposal being underhanded from the beginning; dishonesty in the entire project; 13 total Inland Ports in the United States (including two very large ones located in Riverside, CA and Phoenix/Tucson); SLC said they would be the gateway of the west (Phoenix already said it was the hub of the west); nothing unique about the proposal except environmental blight and disaster; City Council putting taxpayers on the hook for \$28 million plus interest in exchange for a travesty providing low-paying/meaningless jobs and warehouses.

Further comments included: calculation that road maintenance fees would result in \$6.8 million over the 20 years of this tax increment agreement; who would benefit by bestowing this tax break; why elected officials make promises to those that have donated to their campaign or assured them a position; low-paying jobs requiring even more low-income housing; low-income workers needing other services such as school and general community support; the result costing taxpayers more than they were being told; citizens should pay attention to voting on this project and consider that in the upcoming municipal elections; comprehensive plans with environmental assessments and needs had not been developed; Inland Port would severely effect air, water, light, and noise landscape which are already under attack and causing health issues for Utah citizens; this project was only feasible for the developers if citizens pay for the infrastructure the private land owners need; no room for compromise; and the Board not even considering the public wishes being deplorable.

The following individuals submitted written comments against the proposal but did not speak: **Naomi Franklin, Bron Thayn, Clark Clements, Matt Peterson, Stan Holmes, Barbara Bowen, John Prehn, Tena Rohr, Christopher Rohr, Cody Curtis, Harriett Emerson, Sue Geary, Dianne Budig, Nancy Howard, Carolyn Erickson, Stephanie Weens, Ken Kohler, Meahdow Raigne, Melanie Pehrson Nye, Mary Paust, Erin Finney, Brooke Larson, Nick Norton, Nikki Van Dyk, Kate Savage, Natascha Deininger, Mary Paul, and Mary Ellen Sloan.**

Comments included: clear memory of the SLC agreement within this last year committing to 100% renewable energy future; Inland Port concept

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

having zero relationship to clean energy; no concerns expressed by Staff or officials regarding clean energy; inquiry as to where each individual Council Member stood on the project; needing an Air Quality Impact Statement to be made available to the public; approval at this point was immature; no public benefit/only huge downside; massive harm to SLC residents for benefit of a few; destruction of the Great Salt Lake ecosystem jewel; opposing use of tax dollars to incentivize building of the polluting port; opposing destruction of the avian habitat that was unique in all the world; elected officials were supposed to represent the people; too many issues requiring further study such as environmental impacts and air pollution; if the Legislature truly cared about Utah's economic needs, they would invest in job development in rural Utah to replace declining coal mining and other industry jobs; \$28 million should be used for better air quality or increase teacher salaries; imploring the Board to be bold in their vision and courageous in their decision-making; planet having an expiration date; need to turn away from speed and growth beyond resources; impacts to the Great Salt Lake migration and birds which are a big economic driver in Utah; utilizing existing untapped resources (especially on the west side), and the need to study highway transportation impacts.

Sylvia Gray referenced [a letter from Friends of Great Salt Lake](#) and urged the Board to vote against the tax increment reimbursement. She discussed the ecosystem and bird species in that area and said private development should not use tax dollars. She said development would happen on its own and these warehouses should be built elsewhere.

John Wilkes provided comments and [referenced a letter he wrote](#) in opposition of the proposal. He discussed the definition of the word "representative" as being to speak or act on behalf of others. He said the Inland Port project was unnecessary and unsustainable.

David Scheer provided comments and referenced a [letter of analysis he wrote](#) relative to review of the third-party infrastructure benefits analysis. He asked the Board to reject the current analysis as biased and inadequate and said a new analysis should be commissioned from another, unbiased consultant who will not cherry-pick data or overlook unfavorable trends.

The following submitted letters (linked by name) in opposition of the project: [Shantell Garrett](#), [Andrew Middleton](#), [D. K. Kilmer](#), [Ken Kraus](#) and [Julie Miller](#), [Elizabeth Braymen](#), and [Claudia Norton](#).

Barbara Polich [provided a letter](#) and said she had 40 years of legal expertise and would like to focus on two things: 1) the need for additional information; and 2) the Staff Report was premised upon the assumption that SLC was obligated to fulfill the reimbursement agreement

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

executed in 2018 (a private issue discussed by the City Council). She said determining whether a contract was binding required analysis, and other defenses to the contract that may exist were not presented. She said in her opinion, the overlay of the State legislative action gave rise to any number of challenges predicated upon the cities (such as loss of control over zoning and collection of tax revenues). She urged the Board to not assume they were obligated under this agreement.

Jonny Vasic, Executive Director for Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment, said air pollution was a broad-based health hazard. He said there was no safe level of pollution and a confirmed relationship between poor health and air pollution. He said there was no scenario where a port would not add significant air pollution or make the air cleaner.

Shawn Eaton said he represented the architectural firm that designed the warehouses for the development being called into question. He said there were things done to limit environmental impacts of the buildings. He described the higher (according to LEED guidelines) standards, LED lighting throughout, thermal mass panel construction (thermal envelope outside and concrete inside) that resists temperature change and utilizes less energy, skylights and natural lights, white membrane roofs, and solar equipped.

Zach Hartman said he was hired by the Colmena family in 2013 and this had not been a quick project. He said discussions had taken place with environmental and eco groups and SLC had the duty to remedy environmental issues associated with the landfill. He said the whole point of having an Inland Port was to create regional rail lines. He said the citizens need to be provided facts from both sides.

B. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

C. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BUSINESS

#1. [6:24:07 PM](#) Approval of Minutes. Director Rogers moved and Director Luke seconded to **approve the minutes of the RDA Board meeting held Tuesday, June 11, 2019 and Tuesday, July 9, 2019**, which motion carried, all directors voted aye. [View Minutes](#)
(M 19-6)

#2. [6:24:21 PM](#) RDA Capital Improvement Program Projects (CIP). *The Board will hold a follow-up discussion about the Mayor's proposed RDA capital projects for Fiscal Year 2019-20. Capital projects typically involved the construction, purchase or redevelopment of buildings, infrastructure or public spaces. Generally, projects have a useful life*

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

of five or more years and cost \$50,000 or more. [View Attachments](#)

A unanimous Straw Poll was taken to adopt the RDA CIP Budget at this time.

Director Wharton moved and Director Rogers seconded to approve the RDA Capital Project funding allocations as requested by the Administration, which motion carried, all voted aye.

#3. [4:15:16 PM](#) NWQ LLC Tax Increment Agreement. The Board will discuss, and consider adopting, a resolution authorizing a property tax increment reimbursement of up to \$28 million to NWQ, LLC over a 20-year term, to repay the developer for certain public and site improvements, with the actual reimbursement amount based on increment generated only by the project. [View Attachments](#)

Danny Walz, Tammy Hunsaker, Cindy Gust-Jenson, Jennifer Bruno, Katherine Lewis, and Wade Budge briefed the Board with attachments. Mr. Walz said the RDA was not building in the Inland Port and not subsidizing the project (it was a private development). He said it was important to note the overall project area had a split between the City's portion (75% of increment) and the RDA portion (25%). He said the reimbursement agreement was performance based and tied to the development's property tax generation. He referenced the timeline process undertaken over several years which led up to the creation of the Community Reinvestment Area (CRA) which was established in January 2018. He said the next step in the process was to consider the reimbursement agreement (includes policy, terms, cap, items eligible for reimbursement based on project development).

Ms. Hunsaker said RDA participation would be 70% for a term of 20 years (maximum reimbursement \$28 million). She referenced the public benefits analysis and the highest scenario estimate at \$28 million but said \$19 million might be more realistic and it all depended on project growth. She said there were expenses identified that were split out between systemwide improvements (\$23 million/projects to eventually be deeded to the City) and project specific (\$62 million/local roads to serve specific development/sustainability upgrades to buildings).

Director Wharton asked if any tax increment could be utilized for construction or to front the cost of the buildings. Mr. Walz said the majority of the reimbursement covered actual City-owned portions. He said there was a line item list of eligible expenses that could be used by the increment to help offset the cost. He said there was obviously a much larger investment by the developer. He said the policy and general motivation behind the project area was to pay for the burden costs (environmental and infrastructure) to develop that area. He reviewed the

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

Agency's requirement to verify and ability to only reimburse actual costs (versus normal building construction costs).

Ms. Bruno discussed the 2007 Master Plan process that went before the Planning Commission (one property owner/residential development/30,000 homes). She said the recession hit at that time and the owner decided to sell the property. Clarification was offered that discussion at this time did not entail the Inland Port but rather a piece of land included in the Northwest Quadrant Master Plan (a piece of the Inland Port). Ms. Bruno said the Inland Port area also encompassed portions of Magna and West Valley and this CRA only covered land north of I-80 (different from Northwest Quadrant Master Plan Area). She said in 2015, at the request of the new property owners, the City looked at restarting the Master Plan process. Ms. Hunsaker said that was adopted in August of 2016. She said areas were identified, including buffers between developable and non-developable areas. She said this particular development fell entirely within the developable area and a small piece into the area including special design considerations.

Ms. Gust-Jenson said City Planning would be the best resource and they could come before the Board to answer questions and discuss the process, policy, and other background. Director Wharton said he was curious if the area had not been developed due to seismic concerns. Ms. Bruno said when the prison site was identified and relocated, the Mayor initiated a petition in November 2016 to rezone (in September 2016 the Council adopted the Northwest Quadrant Master Plan overlay which included additional zoning requirements and considerations).

Mr. Walz outlined the proposed area to include 8-10 industrial warehouse buildings. Discussion followed regarding the proposed 2,900 jobs and whether those would be quality jobs or if people would be able to afford to live in the City. Mr. Walz said as part of the requirement for the reimbursement agreement, there was requirement for a public benefit analysis conducted by a third-party consultant. He said that study was then used as justification for authorizing the project. He said he could speak to the design and what the developer intended to market, but there were no tenants identified/under contract. Ms. Hunsaker said the developer would target manufacturing jobs primarily and the public analysis contractor could speak to it. Concern was expressed about the affordability component or that there may be discrepancy between jobs and wages for warehousing versus manufacturing. Ms. Bruno said although wages and employment were important, the only thing that mattered was property tax. She said the analysis was merely interesting in terms of potential impacts to the economy.

Wade Budge, representing the property owner NWQ LLC, discussed the project. He said the intended building technique included taking stand-

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

up concrete/build-up walls and adding another layer in terms of insulation and concrete (creating a sandwich). He said a commitment was made for tenants to have the smallest carbon footprint possible in effort to reflect sustainability values as contained in City ordinances. He said this technology had been deployed on a smaller scale and would set the City apart by employing this technology (setting this project up as an example). He discussed intent to attract not only entry-level jobs but tenants who could provide talent for increasingly technical activity in these buildings (light manufacturing, assembly, research, and other uses).

Director Mendenhall clarified this project was not part of State participation or involving the Inland Port Authority. She said the Board was keenly interested in the progress of the Inland Port area and inquired what options NWQ LLC would have if this Board voted against the application. Mr. Budge discussed the intent to work with the City to attain and set forth the agreement entered into in 2018. He said they could always look at opportunities to partner with others but believed what was being brought forward made sense for the City and both were making huge investments in the area. Director Mendenhall said the Board was hearing "no" from the residents. She asked Mr. Budge, as the applicant's legal counsel (regarding the 40-year agreement and contemplation to several reimbursement agreements), if the developer anticipated going anywhere. Mr. Budge said they were not anticipating going anywhere, had remained consistent and transparent, and there was an agreement with the City that no one else should interfere with. He said the Master Plan was amended in 2016, rezone in 2017, agreement in 2018, and huge investments made as a result of that entire process. He said to ensure they all worked together, there was need to reflect that reality and a continued process to be followed.

Director Valdemoros said the Mayor signed the agreement in 2018. She expressed concern the Mayor had committed SLC to fulfill a contract she had signed, she had been encouraged to attend the meeting to discuss why she favored this development and why the Board should approve, yet she was not present. She said this made it difficult to have an in-depth discussion and she felt the Mayor should be present for the benefit of both the Board and the public. She requested the Mayor attend a public meeting, state her position, and answer questions.

Director Johnston said the landscape had changed since the original development agreement (Inland Port/Legislation) and inquired why the developer would not want to wait for the visioning process to be completed. Mr. Budge said the proposal was for development in the area already zoned and that study would focus on how larger transportation would function. He said it was important to recognize this was a modest proposal for a very large area. He said they were starting with a use

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

and project similar and consistent with adjoining properties. He said they were providing redevelopment in an area that needed it (former landfill immediately adjacent to the west). Director Johnston further discussed the visioning process and how it could make this port different than others. He inquired as to the benefit of developing now versus drawback of waiting. Mr. Budge said the term was running on the agreement (40-year development agreement term/uses allowed and not allowed) and this was a small portion of the overall area to be developed. He said they were limited to light-manufacturing uses. He said by doing it now, they would have information and data for future phases.

Mr. Walz clarified the reimbursement agreement term was 20-year and the larger development agreement was 40-year. He said it was also important to note this project area was within the larger Inland Port Authority boundary. He said the development agreement was executed in 2018 and the right to control the City's portion of property tax increment was preserved (and not preserved for any other entities). He said should the City's portion of tax increment not be utilized, the Inland Port Authority would take over and they had jurisdiction over the remaining property tax increment in this area.

Inquiry was raised as to whether the Inland Port Authority financial jurisdiction could expand if the Board were not to participate in this agreement. Ms. Lewis said she wanted additional time to review the Port Authority Act to be able to respond (whether both the project area and the development agreement would be grandfathered). She said she was happy to review the agreement (which stated the developer "shall be entitled" to tax increment reimbursement subject to RDA policy). She said there was an adopted policy (what that meant/were there teeth/had the developer complied/any other questions to address). She said she could respond in writing with further detail.

Director Rogers asked, as the Inland Port Board moved forward, would the developers be amenable to adjusting as that process moved forward (i.e. market wage, community impact board). Mr. Budge said certainly, this project would require that kind of "checking in" to determine what adjustments should be made. He said there was need to ensure goals were being met.

Discussion followed regarding evidence as to why tax increment would be better used. Mr. Walz discussed factors involved with agency determination to review the gap that may warrant use of tax increment. He referenced the Lewis-Young study (this site had significant costs and warranted the use of tax increment). Debate followed regarding the risks involved with not developing the site at this time versus benefits. The Board discussed the resident's request for independent evaluation in this regard. Mr. Walz said the study was not commissioned by the

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

developer. He reviewed the goals, scope, and findings of the required third-party analysis. He said public input was also solicited when the development agreement was previously considered (2017-2018). Ms. Bruno said the development would have to happen and the developer would only receive a portion of tax increment generated.

Director Luke inquired if the tax increment financing piece was tied to the development agreement (impacts of not approving this request). Mr. Walz said the reimbursement was a factor in the development agreement and required establishment of a policy, time limits to bring to the Board for consideration, and items for application to meet those terms. He said if such were not approved, the Board would need to provide reasoning for why it did not meet those policy terms. Inquiry was raised as to whether this could impact boundaries for wetlands included in the agreement. Ms. Bruno said because the zoning was referenced in the development agreement, it would be locked in. She said if it were not locked in, another developer could petition for a zoning change. Ms. Gust-Jenson said previously, the Legislature had legislation that would have taken a larger piece of the City's zoning control. She said if the Legislature would override City zoning and there was a contract not fulfilled by the City, that could be a situation where the Legislation might not honor those swathes of land as they were held out for bird habitat.

Discussion followed regarding Inland Port Authority boundaries in comparison to this project area. Discussion followed regarding the CRA being grandfathered in, with Ms. Lewis stating legislation could change. She cautioned the Board about reasoning for asking for more time and considering whether this project had the public benefit required and met those requirements set into place.

Director Luke said this was a difficult situation for the Board and questions had to be asked. The Board discussed this development as having met clear processes required that were conducted with public input, transparency, community involvement, negotiation, and general comments.

#4. 6:10:01 PM Block 67 North Community Reinvestment Area Interlocal Agreements with Salt Lake County. *The Board will be briefed about a resolution which authorizes an interlocal agreement with Salt Lake County, as part of the proposed development on the Block 67 North Community Reinvestment Area (CRA). Block 67 is a City block bounded by 100 South, 200 South, 200 West and 300 West, and the development project would contain a residential, commercial and hotel complex, as well as an underground parking structure. The Board approved the creation of the Block 67 North CRA on March 26, 2019, in part to facilitate the County's transfer of \$15 million in transportation funds to the developer for the parking structure. [View Attachments](#)*

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

Danny Walz, Corrine Piazza, and Allison Rowland briefed the Board with attachments. Mr. Walz said the RDA Board approved the creation of the Block 67 North CRA on March 26, 2019, to facilitate the County's transfer of \$15 million in transportation funds to be used for construction of a regionally-significant underground parking structure. He said the interlocal agreement also includes provisions for improvements to the Japantown area, specifically along 100 South, between 200 West and 300 West, to mitigate some of the effects of the development project on this historic section of the City. He said the interlocal agreement would authorize acceptance of County tax increment to implement the CRA Plan. He further discussed the project, terms, budget, phases, and details to be approved on the City Council side. He said generally all reimbursement agreements included the ability to withhold funds based on specific milestones or performance measures. He said this was different because the performance milestone was tied to a second phase (all payments would stop if phase two did not happen). He said the RDA and Council would be reviewing this item at several upcoming meetings including public comment opportunities. He said Staff continued to work with the School District to secure their participation.

Ms. Piazza discussed Japantown agreements (20% set aside over 10 years). She said a trigger point for phase one would be approval of the design elements (included in the reimbursement agreement with the developer). She said through the facilitation process, the Request for Proposal (RFP) was ready and should be posted by the end of the month. She said that group was working on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Salt Lake County on how to handle Salt Palace events and festivals. She said the attempt was to run as a parallel tract so the 10% being collected could be utilized to consider potential improvements to that area for some type of cultural district. Inquiry was raised as to Salt Lake County participation in the cultural district, with Ms. Piazza stating they had been involved during the entire process. She said they had discussed other sources, but the idea was to create the design strategy first (implementation and maintenance costs included) in an effort to determine a realistic funding strategy.

Ms. Rowland said discussion had taken place with the Japantown group regarding the schedule of adoption. She said they still had interest and would be available at times when option for public comment was offered. Ms. Piazza said their main concern was for commitments that came out of facilitation to be included in the agreements (they would have to happen). She said Staff reviewed those agreements with representatives in person, so they were aware. Director Mendenhall said she wanted to hear from Salt Lake County regarding their commitment and involvement. Mr. Walz said that could be arranged for a future meeting.

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

#5. Utah Theater Redevelopment Update. *The Board will be briefed about the potential redevelopment of the Utah Theater, located at 144 South Main Street, and adjacent retail property. [View Attachments](#)*

Director Fowler indicated this item would be moved to a future agenda.

#6. Report and Announcements from the Executive Director. *Report of the Executive Director, including a review of information items, announcements, and scheduling items. The Board of Directors may give feedback or policy input.*

No discussion held.

#7. Report and Announcements from RDA Staff. *The Board may review Board information and announcements. The Board may give feedback on any item related to City business, including but not limited to the Spyhop Groundbreaking and Scheduling Items.*

Mr. Walz reported on the successful Spyhop groundbreaking event.

#8. Report of the Chair and Vice Chair.

No discussion held.

D. WRITTEN BRIEFINGS

#1. Loan Portfolio Report - as of June 30, 2019. *The Board will receive a semiannual written report about the current status of the RDA's loan portfolio, which identifies:*

- *New loans closed between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019;*
- *Outstanding principal for each loan fund;*
- *Any delinquencies; and*
- *The remaining amount available to lend in the existing portfolio. [View Attachment](#)*

No discussion held.

E. CONSENT

None.

F. [6:28:29 PM](#) CLOSED SESSION. *The Board will consider a motion to enter into Closed Session, in keeping with Utah Code §52-4-205 for any allowed purpose.*

MINUTES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF SALT LAKE CITY

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2019

Director Luke moved and Director Johnston seconded to enter Closed Session for Advice of Counsel/Attorney-Client matters that are privileged pursuant to Utah Code §78B-1-137, Utah Open and Public Meetings Law. A roll call vote was taken. Directors Johnston, Wharton, Luke, Valdemoros, Mendenhall, Fowler, and Rogers voted aye. See File M 19-7 for [Sworn Statement](#).

In Attendance: Directors Johnston, Valdemoros, Wharton, Fowler, Luke, Rogers, and Mendenhall.

Others in Attendance: Cindy Gust-Jenson, Jennifer Bruno, Lehua Weaver, Katherine Lewis, Benjamin Luedtke, Rusty Vetter, Patrick Leary, Nick Tarbet, Tammy Hunsaker, Danny Walz, and Scott Crandall.

The Closed Session and RDA meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Redevelopment Agency Chair

Secretary

This document is not intended to serve as a full transcript as additional discussion may have been held; please refer to the audio or video for entire content pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-203(2)(b).

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency meeting held August 20, 2019.

clm