Point of the Mountain State Land Authority Board

****

**Remote Meeting**

**March 9, 2021**

U**MINUTES**

**Members in Attendance:**

Representative Lowry Snow, Co-Chair

Mayor Dawn Ramsey

Commissioner David Woolstenhulme

Representative Steve Handy

Jim Russell

Mayor Troy Walker

Senator Dan Hemmert

Senator Jerry Stevenson

April Cooper

Alan Matheson, Director

**Others in Attendance:**

Steve Kellenberg Kellenberg Studio

Erin Talkington RCLCO

Muriel Xochimitl X-Factor Communications

Colton Stock X-Factor Communications

Jacey Skinner Ballard Spahr

Carrie Byles SOM

Peter Kindel SOM

Aaron May SOM

Jim MacRae Design Workshop

Kamron Dalton Governor’s Office of Economic Development

Ryan Hales Hales Engineering

David Dobbins Draper City

Jen Robinson Lt. Governor’s Office

Leah Jaramillo Somers-Jaramillo & Associates

Members of the general public

On Tuesday, March 9, 2021 the Point of the Mountain State Land Authority Board held a remote meeting via the Zoom Meeting platform:

<https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_11t67FdJTpC2Y5Eu7F_lAQ>

A video of the meeting can now be found on The Point’s YouTube channel:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QQinOE5oJMo>

The meeting was called to order at 2:04 pm.

* **WELCOME AND MEETING DETERMINATION**

Chair Lowry Snow welcomed board members, consultants and members of the public.

**To meet procedure required by law, Chair Snow read the meeting determination for electronic meetings.**

Chair Snow excused Lt. Governor Deidre Henderson who is attending another meeting and welcomed Jen Robinson, Chief of Staff to the Lt. Governor. The chair recognized that we are now in the master planning process for The Point and our board will be focused on moving the work ahead with an ambitious schedule for the summer. Today’s meeting will be a preview of some of the work going forward.

* **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 9, 2021 BOARD MEETING**

Chair Snow asked for comments or corrections to the minutes. None were brought forward.

## MOTION: April Cooper moved to approve the minutes of the February 9, 2021 board meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

* **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Snow explained that public comment is a very important part of this meeting and opened the floor to any members of the public who would like to speak. There were no comments.

* **MASTER PLAN PROCESS UPDATE**

Chair Snow summarized the work performed by the SOM team with Alan Matheson explaining the commission from the Governor to move forward with plans for The Point. Members of the SOM planning team summarized the analogue research and key conclusions of their work in Stage I and closeout work for Stage II of the master planning process.

Highlights of their recent work from Peter Kindel included:

* Innovation Catalysts – key takeaways and actions
* Project Catalysts
* GIS overview and key conclusions
* Framework Plan Alternatives – Three Program Scenarios

Complete Community – Alternative 1

Regional Hub – Alternative 2

Innovation Center – Alternative 3

There were questions and discussion concerning the concept of an institutional anchor, land use, possibility of non-traditional school for the Canyon School District, market analysis of land use, height of the buildings, affordability of rents for residential and commercial properties, interaction between rent structure and building types, financial model for the property, and smart communities.

* **REPORT OF THE BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE AUTHORITY BUSINESS PLAN**

Chair Snow expressed appreciation to members of the subcommittee and gave a brief description and history of their assignment to create a business plan for The Point. Erin Talkington presented the key points for the business plan:

1. The Role of the State and the Land Authority in Development

Land Authority Should:

Take a proactive approach to coordinating future development

Deliver major site infrastructure

Future “District Developers will be responsible for:

Infrastructure and land development within their district

Connections between district and project-level infrastructure

Creation of individual parcels for development

Each “District Developer” will be governed by a Master Developer Agreement

1. Internal Organizational Structure

Land Authority Should:

Build a team of 5-9 employees to do the work and support Director

Identify an advisory committee of seasoned professionals

Advisory Committee’s Role:

Provide expertise and leverage

Help frame difficult and complicated decision points

Get in the weeds with staff and development partners

1. Subcommittee Discussions – Future Next Steps

State Jurisdiction and Provision of Services

Transaction Structure Options

Infrastructure Costs and Potential Funding Mechanisms

Land Value and Return on Investment

Board members requested that the Advisory Committee have representation from Draper City in order to receive input on city services, public safety, school districts and other issues in the area. In addition, board members requested the SOM team work with Jordan, Canyon and Alpine School Districts to determine need and potential growth.

Additional questions and discussions included future POMSLA funding and relationships with the legislature.

## MOTION: Mayor Dawn Ramsey moved to adopt the Authority’s internal organizational structure and business plan as presented by Erin Talkington with the request that a Draper City representative be included in the Advisory Committee. The motion was seconded by Jim Russell.

Speaking to the motion, Jim Russell expressed support for the business plan which will allow Director Matheson to move forward with obtaining staff to assist with the work that is coming forward in the future.

Speaking to the motion, Mayor Ramsey added that the Draper City representative would be instrumental in working with South Valley Sewer, Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District and Rocky Mountain Power to establish services for the area.

The motion was approved unanimously

* **PROJECT PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS**

Director Alan Matheson proposed a process to evaluate unsolicited project ideas for The Point. Proposals have already started to come in from individuals who would like to purchase land at the site and this defined process will allow us to evaluate their ideas objectively. The first stage would begin with a submitted proposal that gives detailed information about the project. The proposal would go through an evaluation committee who would screen ideas against various criteria in a scoring matrix. The evaluation committee would then score the proposals and push forward high-scoring proposals to the board for review possibly on a semi-annual basis. The second stage would involve refining the high scoring projects, submitting additional information if necessary (such as return on investment calculations) and then review by the board to determine if it should move forward. The third stage is proof of concept where funding agreements and contracts that solidify the project are produced. Stage four is the implementation of the project and incorporating it into the master plan for the property.

There was a question concerning the scoring which would allow a proposal to move forward to the board for consideration

## MOTION: Steve Handy moved to approve the project proposal evaluation process as outlined by Alan Matheson. The motion was seconded by Commission David Woolstenhulm and approved unanimously.

* **REQUEST FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTERESTS FROM THE DEVELOPER COMMUNITY**

Director Matheson explained the value in involving the development community in the planning process and incorporating their expertise in the master plan. In order to be open and fair in this process, he proposed The Point have a formal process which would allow us to issue a request for expressions of interest to ask members of the development community to express interest in being involved in the site. Meetings would be set up to provide input and glean ideas concerning our master plan. Later, possibly at the end of summer, we would issue RFQ’s/RFP’s to identify some of our partners to begin some of the infrastructure work.

Board members expressed support of the process. There was discussion concerning whether the board was ready to move forward with a motion.

## MOTION: Senator Jerry Stevenson suggested the board move forward with the Request for Expressions of Interest from the Developer Community as presented by Alan Matheson and moved that this be placed on the agenda for official adoption at the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Mayor Troy Walker and approved unanimously.

* **LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY**

Director Matheson expressed appreciation to the members of the Legislature who currently serve on the POMSLA committee and reviewed the legislation and funding appropriated for POMSLA during the recent session. Total Land Authority Appropriations include:

* $1,500,000 FY21 Supplemental 1X funding
* $1,750,100 FY22 Ongoing
* $6,500,000 FY22 1X funding

This funding will allow the Authority to hire the positions needed and to cover office space and operational costs and to pay consultants and developer fees if needed. Director Matheson noted there was also funding for the University of Utah to assist their portion of planning for the innovation district at the Point. There was also a bill that passed which will set up a mechanism to collect funds to pay for infrastructure at the site.

There was discussion concerning additional meetings for the board. Director Matheson explained that based on our schedule for the master plan, we will be narrowing the various alternative and test cases into a preferred alternative which will then go forward for public input. We will need to have additional meetings in the future to talk about these concepts in addition to our regular meetings.

Jim Russell reported on a critical issue relating to a current water line easement that runs from Mount Olympus down to The Point site. The water rights have long been vacated but the easement which was originally created when there was no development in the area is now causing concern. The state (DFCM) holds the easement. There are a few individuals who are having difficulties obtaining building permits because the easement runs through their property. DFCM is uncertain if these permits would require board approval. DFCM would like to deal with this on an as-needed basis as people come forward requesting permits. Chair Snow requested this be on the agenda for next month which would give legal counsel time for consultation. Mr. Russell said he is requesting the board give DFCM permission to manage this issue concerning easements on the properties.

* **ADJOURN**

Chair Snow asked for a motion to adjourn.

## MOTION: Jim Russell moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mayor Dawn Ramsey and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:17 pm.