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****
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**March 8, 2022**
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Representative Steve Handy

Senator Lincoln Fillmore

April Cooper

Mayor Troy Walker

Commissioner David Woolstenhulme

Dan Hemmert

Jim Russell

**Others in Attendance:**
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Jacey Skinner Ballard Spahr
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Jeremy Blinkenstaff

Elizabeth Giraud
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David Amott

Dorothy Owen
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Mary Ann Wright

Preservation Resources

Robert Cuthbertson, Jr.

Teresa Cuthbertson

Wendi Petitt

Randall Shoemaker

Lyle Pearson

Logan Fawcett

Jonathan Schachter

Alan Walker

David Dobbins

Colby Oliverson

Jeff Hartley

Brett Millburn

Bim Oliver

James George

John Mackey

Jordan Gillman

Kevin Walkenhorst

Laura Hansen

Lori Haglund

Tamera Walkenhorst

Todd Shoemaker

Jade Teran

Ryan Simmons

Steven James

Leslie Morton

On Tuesday, March 8, 2022 the Point of the Mountain State Land Authority Board held a meeting in the Senate Building, Room 210 at the Utah State Capitol Complex. A virtual meeting option was available for those who attended remotely via the Zoom Meeting platform:

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

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

[bit.ly/thepointyoutube](http://bit.ly/thepointyoutube)

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 am.

* **WELCOME**

Chair Lowry Snow welcomed the board, consultants and staff members to the meeting and excused Lieutenant Governor Deidre Henderson who could not attend. The Chair reviewed the significant progress accomplished since our last meeting in January.

* **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Members of the public who would like to speak were invited to comment subject to the board’s procedures and rules. Individual comments were heard from David Arnott, Wendy Petitt, Tamera Walkenhorst, Randall Shoemaker, MaryAnn Wright, Dorothy Owen, Cindy Cromer, Todd Shoemaker and Elizabeth Giraud who requested the board review the preservation of various structures on the prison property, particularly the prison chapel.

Chair Snow expressed appreciation for comments given from the public and indicated the board will take these under consideration.

* **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 11, 2022 MEETING**

Chair Snow asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. None were brought forward.

## MOTION: Jim Russell moved to approve the minutes of the January 11, 2022 board meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dave Woolstenhulme and approved unanimously.

* **REPORT ON SUPPLEMENTAL STUDIES**

Scott Cuthbertson, Director of Operations for The Point, presented detailed analysis of proposed project enhancements for The Point. The purpose of these studies was to identify the range of strategies available and how those strategies have performed elsewhere, what benefits we could expect from these strategies if we were to incorporate them, what investment would be required to achieve these potential benefits and the potential sources of funding. The emphasis for the studies center on smart mobility, sustainability, and smart city technology. Highlights from Mr. Cuthbertson’s presentation included:

The Vision and Mandate – framework plan goals

Performance Goals

* Carbon – 0% net carbon by 2050 and -20% embodied carbon
* Energy -- 50% less energy from the grid and maximized electrical power with 50% renewables
* Water -- -40% potable water, >15% reuse of water, and 100% non-potable irrigation
* Waste – 50% waste diversion and 75% construction waste diversion
* Smart Capability – 50% of full smart capability
* VMT -- -25% vehicles miles travelled

Sustainability Methodology

Measuring & Comparing Scenarios – goals, cost and innovation

Capital Expenditures

* Who pays for it?
* What are the Baseline Costs?
* What are the Incremental Costs?
* What are the corresponding benefits?

Smart Mobility – Program Elements

* Circulator
* Active Transportation + Micro mobility
* Car Share
* Mobility Hubs
* Mobility as a Service + Mobility Package

A board member questioned whether we’ve considered that parking-reduction projections may be high if residents and employees drive more and are less likely to use mobility alternatives in the winter. Mr. Cuthbertson indicated the site plan will encourage using alternatives to private vehicles and will help mitigate this problem. In addition, we have planned for phased parking at the site so we can re-evaluate parking needs and strategies as the technology and development progress.

Sustainability and Smart City Technology Strategies

* Water
* Buildings: Energy
* Waste – “pay as you throw” program, enhanced recycling, waste recycling

Smart City Recommendations – Smart Systems

* Smart ICT Infrastructure
* Smart Environments
* Smart Utilities
* Smart Community
* Smart Mobility
* Smart Building

Gameboard Options – Strategies from the Cost Optimized Scenario

Representative Steve Handy expressed enthusiasm for the smart technology and asked if the geothermal source at the site been investigated. Mr. Cuthbertson reported there has been some preliminary analysis of the geothermal resource. While it likely cannot serve the entire site, it could be incorporated into a closed-loop system that provides heating to much of the project. Representative Handy recommended the Energy and Geosciences Department at the University of Utah as a source for additional information. Representative Handy also asked about community solar in terms of a competitive system. They are also looking into community solar but there are some dependencies around it.

Sustainability Model

Program Scenarios

* Goal Optimized Approach
* Cost Optimized
* Innovative
* Scenario Comparisons

There was discussion concerning how the various solutions and approaches could be optimized at The Point and the savings that would help subsidize some of the programs to achieve affordability. Comments were made concerning the importance of an appropriate return on investment and the cost premium threshold for the project. Creative financing should also be available to developers. A board member asked about the fees received from a proposed District Association (a utility district with bonding capacity) and the upfront costs which would need to be raised through a public-private partnership arrangement. Board members recognized and expressed appreciation for the analysis and felt this provided a great framework for future decisions.

* **DEVELOPMENT PARTNER SELECTION PROCESS**

Chair Snow reported that one of the most important actions the board will take will be to select a development partner for the Point. In December, a nation-wide RFP was issued in order to gather applicants to serve as Phase 1 development partners. There was enthusiastic response from several top local and national firms. The board will now select a small group of firms who will move into stage two of this selection process. The Chair requested the board move into a closed session to discuss the qualifications of the higher-scoring applicants.

## MOTION: Jim Russell moved that the board move into an executive session. The motion was seconded by April Cooper and passed unanimously.

The board returned from the executive session at 11:23 am.

The Chair reported that the board would not hear the last agenda item concerning Legislative Updates but will receive an email from the Executive Director giving details on legislative action for 2022.

Executive Director Alan Matheson reported there were nine teams that submitted proposals as part of stage one of the selection process. He reported that all teams were very strong and narrowing the field was a difficult task. He explained the process used by the selection committee—including reviewing applications, interviewing candidates, and scoring the teams—to develop its recommendations to the board. The selection committee recommended that the board move the following teams to stage two of the selection process: 1) Boyer-Gardner-Centercal, 2) Catellus-Dakota Pacific, and 3) Lincoln-Colmena-Wadsworth Team. Chair Snow requested a motion to select the firms that would move on to stage two of the process.

## MOTION: Jim Russell moved that we invite the following three teams to stage two of the selection process: 1) Boyer-Gardner-Centercal, 2) Catellus-Dakota Pacific, and 3) Lincoln-Colmena-Wadsworth. The motion was seconded by Mayor Troy Walker.

**SPEAKING TO THE MOTION**:

Jim Russell commented this was a great process with all nine of the firms having exceptional qualifications which made for a difficult decision. The selection committee felt these three firms were the most responsive and prepared to move forward. Each of the three firms have a different approach to the project which will make for a healthy process.

## Voting: The motion passed unanimously.

The Chair recognized and gave credit to the legislative members of the board: Senator Stevenson, Senator Fillmore and Representative Handy who were supportive of the legislation specific to this board during the recent session. He also recognized Jacey Skinner, counsel to the board, who worked to push HB48 through the house and senate during the last few weeks of session.

* **ADJOURN**

Chair Snow asked for a motion to adjourn.

## MOTION: Jim Russell moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by April Cooper.

The meeting adjourned at 11:29 am.