



**NOTICE OF A MEETING OF THE VINEYARD  
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD  
March 13, 2019 – 6:00 PM**

---

Public Notice is hereby given that the Vineyard Redevelopment Agency Board will hold a meeting on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, starting at approximately 6:00 PM or as soon thereafter as possible following the City Council meeting in the Vineyard City Hall; 125 South Main Street, Vineyard, Utah. The agenda will consist of the following:

---

**Agenda**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. CONSENT AGENDA**

**2.1. [Approval of the February 13, 2019 RDA Meeting Minutes](#)**

**3. BUSINESS ITEMS – [CAMU Reimbursement](#)**

**3.1** The RDA Board entered into an agreement for participation on the eastside with a not-to-exceed amount of \$18,085,914. Anderson Geneva is requesting that the RDA pay \$6,274,651 to US Steel. This amount is \$30,000 more than the original agreement. Anderson Geneva is agreeing to keep the total reimbursement of the project at the agreed upon amount of \$18,085,914. The RDA Board will take appropriate action.

**4. ADJOURNMENT**

RDA meetings are scheduled as needed.

The Public is invited to participate in all Vineyard Redevelopment Agency meetings. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during this meeting should notify the City Recorder at least 24 hours before the meeting by calling (801) 226-1929.

I the undersigned duly appointed City Recorder for Vineyard, Utah, hereby certify that the foregoing notice and agenda was emailed to the Salt Lake Tribune, posted at the Vineyard City Hall and offices, the Vineyard city website, the Utah Public Notice website, delivered electronically to city staff and to each member of the Governing Body.

AGENDA NOTICING COMPLETED ON: March 12, 2019

CERTIFIED (NOTICED) BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer  
PAMELA SPENCER, CITY RECORDER

1 **MINUTES OF THE VINEYARD**  
2 **REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD MEETING**  
3 City Hall, 125 South Main, Vineyard, Utah  
4 February 13, 2019 – 7:58 PM  
5  
6  
7

8 **Present**

**Absent**

9 Chair Julie Fullmer

10 Boardmember John Earnest

11 Boardmember Tyce Flake

12 Boardmember Chris Judd

13 Boardmember Nate Riley

14  
15 **Staff Present:** City Manager/Finance Director Jacob McHargue, Public Works Director/City  
16 Engineer Don Overson, Assistant City Engineer Chris Wilson, City Attorney David Church,  
17 Sergeant Holden Rockwell with the Utah County Sheriff's Office, Community Development  
18 Director Morgan Brim, Planning Commission Chair Cristy Welsh, City Planner Elizabeth Hart,  
19 City Recorder Pamela Spencer, Water/Parks Manager Sullivan Love  
20

21 **Others Speaking:** Brandon Watson with Edge Homes, Resident David Lauret  
22

23 **7:58 PM REDEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING**  
24  
25

26 **CALL TO ORDER**

27 Chair Fullmer opened the meeting at 7:58 PM.  
28  
29

30 **CONSENT AGENDA**

31 **2.1** Approval of the January 9, 2018 RDA Meeting Minutes  
32

33 Chair Fullmer called for a motion.  
34

35 **Motion:** BOARDMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO APPROVE 2.1 ON THE CONSENT  
36 AGENDA. BOARDMEMBER EARNEST SECONDED THE MOTION. CHAIR FULLMER,  
37 BOARDMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. MOTION  
38 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
39

40 **BUSINESS ITEMS**  
41

42 **3.1 DISCUSSION AND ACTION – Lakefront @ Town Center Open Space Reimbursement**  
43 **Agreement**

44 Jed Stewart with Edge Homes is requesting a reimbursement agreement to improve the  
45 undeveloped area between Edge Homes' Lakefront project and the existing Lake Side trail.  
46 The RDA Board will take appropriate action.  
47

48 Chair Fullmer turned the time over to City Manager/Finance Director Jacob McHargue.  
49

50 Mr. McHargue explained that this reimbursement request was for the open space between the  
51 Edge Homes development and the lake. He said that they had not given the developer credit  
52 towards the open space because it was on state lands and needed the state's approval first. He felt

53 that it would be in the RDA's best interest to have the land improved. He said that the developer  
54 had submitted an application for reimbursement for whatever the costs were to improve the open  
55 space. He felt that this would eliminate a lot of the illegal activity happening in that area.  
56 Boardmember Riley asked if there was a percentage of the dollar amount they were asking for and  
57 if the developer was willing to contribute. Mr. McHargue replied that he had a preliminary  
58 meeting with the developer today to discuss what the cost sharing would be. There was a  
59 discussion about the cost sharing.

60  
61 Boardmember Riley asked where the existing trail was at. Mr. McHargue replied that the existing  
62 trail would stay.

63  
64 The board asked what the plan and timeline was to develop land. Boardmember Judd asked if  
65 there was any feedback from the discussion held earlier in the day. Brandon Watson with Edge  
66 Homes said that they had not been given any credit for this open space, so as far as contribution  
67 went, and if they were asked to contribute a percentage then they would want credit for the open  
68 space. He explained that there would be a trail along the back of the condominium units, a  
69 connection to the existing trail, and that the landscaping would be a mixture of native  
70 revegetation. Chair Fullmer asked if this would follow the in-lieu substitution of open space and  
71 be in place of the promenade or if it would be reimbursed. Mr. Watson replied that they wanted  
72 the funds to go towards the promenade. He explained that the trail running along the  
73 condominiums would be landscaped with sod and/or vegetation and the Homeowners Association  
74 (HOA) would maintain it. He further explained that beyond the trail would be native vegetation.  
75 Boardmember Judd suggested that they try to get matching grants and give the developer credit if  
76 they help find them.

77  
78 Boardmember Riley stated that the developer would benefit immensely from the improvements  
79 and that he needed to decide how much he was willing to contribute. He felt that improving the  
80 land was in the developers' best interest, in order to attract people and build the units. He did not  
81 know if it was 100 percent the city's responsibility. Chair Fullmer asked if the promenade could  
82 be exchanged for other areas. Mr. Brim replied that the code allowed for other areas as approved  
83 by the City Planner and Council. He stated that the promenade was clearly the priority in the  
84 code. Chair Fullmer asked if it still followed the code if the city did not own the land. Mr. Brim  
85 replied that he would look into it. He felt that the promenade was a lot clearer in the code. Chair  
86 Fullmer stated that the promenade was her first priority. Boardmember Riley felt that this  
87 application was deceiving. He also felt that if it was going to be native grasses, then he did not  
88 want it. Mr. Brim suggested that they could have conditions in the agreement. He said that the  
89 idea was to give base line improvements.

90  
91 Boardmember Earnest felt that the developer and city could be more creative on the  
92 improvements. There was a discussion about the process with the state.

93  
94 Boardmember Flake asked if the road was bisecting that area. Mr. Brim replied that the road  
95 would go away. Boardmember Earnest stated that he wanted to know what the state would let the  
96 city do before they put money into it. Boardmember Flake asked who would be responsible to  
97 maintain it. Mr. Church replied that the state lease/rights would have to be with the city and the  
98 city would have outlined rights in order to use it for public benefit.

99  
100 Boardmember Judd asked if they were establishing this as a property tax increment. Mr.  
101 McHargue replied that the reimbursement agreement would have to come from the tax increment.  
102 Boardmember Judd stated that he was excited to get this area as green space. He said that he was  
103 willing to count this as equity in open space, if the developer were to help get grants. He stated

104 that he did not want to exchange the in lieu of open space for the promenade. Mr. Brim felt that  
105 they needed to meet with the state first and then hold a work session to discuss the vision for the  
106 area.

107  
108 Resident David Lauret asked if the code required 30 percent green space and was it negotiated  
109 down. Mr. Brim replied that it was 20 percent and based off of the open space types. He added that  
110 they would be getting more than 20 percent.

111  
112 Boardmember Riley suggested that they look into involvement from the Utah Lake Commission.  
113 Mr. Brim felt that it would be good to have a liaison from the board to work with them. Chair  
114 Fullmer reminded the board the Boardmember Flake served on the Utah Lake Commission, but  
115 suggested that he and Boardmember Earnest work on it together.

116  
117  
118 **ADJOURNMENT**

119 Chair Fullmer called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

120  
121 **Motion:** BOARDMEMBER FLAKE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:16 PM.  
122 BOARDMEMBER EARNEST SECONDED THE MOTION. CHAIR FULLMER,  
123 BOARDMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. MOTION  
124 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

125  
126  
127 RDA meetings are scheduled as needed.

128  
129  
130 MINUTES APPROVED ON: \_\_\_\_\_

131  
132 CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer \_\_\_\_\_

133 PAMELA SPENCER, CITY RECORDER  
134



## VINEYARD RDA STAFF REPORT

**Date:** 03-13-2019  
**Agenda Item:** 3.1 – CAMU Reimbursement  
**From:** Jacob McHargue  
**Subject:** RDA Reimbursement Request

---

### **Background/Discussion:**

The RDA Board entered into an agreement for participation on the eastside with a not-to-exceed amount of \$18,085,914. This agreement was intended to assist the developer with the remediation needed on the Eastside and included a description of the work that needed to be done and budgets for each phase of the work. There was a specific payment that was due to USS based on an agreement between the developer and USS. The amount stipulated in our agreement for that payment was \$6,244,651. There is an updated agreement between the developer and USS that has a different payment amount of \$6,274,651. The developer is requesting that we make up the difference between our contract amount and the actual contract costs that have been updated since our agreement was signed. The developer has agreed to pull this money from other budgets and stay within the overall approval of \$18,085,914.

### **Fiscal Impact:**

The Fiscal Impact of the staff recommendation is just timing of when the money will be spent. The money programmed for this project is 2017 Bond Funds and we have a sufficient amount to cover the payment.

### **Recommendation:**

Staff Recommendation is that we cover the additional costs for the payment, but that we keep the overall approval the same at \$18,085,914.

### **Sample Motion:**

I move to approve the request as presented by staff with the stipulation that we keep the overall approval at \$18,085,914 as referenced in our contract with Anderson Geneva.

**Attachments: RDA Participation Agreement**