

AMERICAN FORK REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
JANUARY 22, 2019
NOTICE AND AGENDA

ANNUAL MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Annual Meeting of the American Fork Redevelopment Agency will be held on January 22, 2019, in the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 6:45 p.m. The agenda shall be as follows:

1. Roll call
2. Appointment of the Vice-Chairperson for 2019
3. Appointment of the Purchasing Agent for 2019
4. Approval of the October 23, 2018 special session minutes
5. Report of the Chairman on RDA/CRA Projects
6. Unfinished business
7. New business
8. Adjournment

Dated this 18 day of January, 2019.



Terilyn Lurker
Secretary



REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

CITY OF AMERICAN FORK

JANUARY 22, 2019

Department Secretary Director Approval Terilyn Lurker

AGENDA ITEM Appointment of the Vice-Chairperson for 2019.

BACKGROUND

In January of 2016, the Redevelopment Agency adopted the RDA Strategic plan and recommendation for governance. The by-laws spell out the agency officers and which city staff position would fill that position. The agency officers and personnel are as follows:

Chair	Mayor
Vice-Chair	City Council Member
Secretary	City Recorder
Treasurer	Treasurer
Executive Director	City Administrator
Redevelopment Director	Economic Development Director (City Planner)
Purchasing Agent(s)	Appointed by the RDA Board
Finance Director	Finance Director

The RDA board needs to appoint the Vice Chair for 2019.

SUGGESTED MOTION

I move to appoint _____ as Vice-Chair of the RDA board for 2019.



REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

CITY OF AMERICAN FORK

JANUARY 22, 2019

Department Secretary Director Approval Terilyn Lurker

AGENDA ITEM Appointment of the Purchasing Agent for 2019.

BACKGROUND

In January of 2016, the Redevelopment Agency adopted the RDA Strategic plan and recommendation for governance. The by-laws spell out the agency officers and which city staff position would fill that position. The agency officers and personnel are as follows:

Chair	Mayor
Vice-Chair	City Council Member
Secretary	City Recorder
Treasurer	Treasurer
Executive Director	City Administrator
Redevelopment Director	Economic Development Director (City Planner)
Purchasing Agent(s)	Appointed by the RDA Board
Finance Director	Finance Director

The RDA board needs to appoint the Purchasing Agent for 2019 and it is recommended that Kyle Maurer be appointed as Purchasing Agent.

SUGGESTED MOTION

I move to appoint Kyle Maurer as the Purchasing Agent of the RDA for 2019.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
OCTOBER 23, 2018
MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Bradley Frost Chairman
 Kevin Barnes Board Member
 Staci Carroll Board Member
 Barbara Christiansen Board Member
 Rob Shelton Board Member
 Clark Taylor Board Member

Staff Present: Terilyn Lurker Secretary
 David Bunker City Administrator
 Kyle Maurer Finance Director
 George Schade IT Director
 Adam Olsen City Planner
 Darren Falslev Police Chief
 Scott Sensanbaugher Public Works Director

Also Present: Jason Burningham, and approximately 10 additional people.

The American Fork Redevelopment Agency met in a special session on Tuesday, October 23, 2018, in the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 6:10 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Chairman Frost welcomed everyone to the meeting. Roll call was taken.

2. Presentation and acceptance of the 2018 Redevelopment Agency Annual Report.

Jason Burningham was introduced by Chairman Frost to give the RDA annual report. Mr. Burningham explained it was required to give an annual report of the RDA, which was due by November 1st of each year.

Mr. Burningham explained they had to review the City's projects, the sources, and tax increment. He noted that he would also be discussing the Patriot Station CRA; some of the parcels were in the unincorporated County, and the interlocal agreement would include these and other parcels not within the City. He said they would provide a resolution with the intent to create a Transportation Reinvestment Zone. The City had three project areas that received two categories of revenues: property tax increment and additional tax increment. He referred to additional tax increment as haircut monies, and stated that the additional tax increment was a one-time carve-out for municipalities that identified qualified projects. The State adopted legislation that had community-oriented projects qualified to receive these taxes. The skate board park, the boat harbor improvements, the amphitheater, the City Hall remodel, and the fitness center remodel all qualified for these funds. He commented that the East Main and the North Valley RDA could continue to receive these tax increments. The Egg Farm EDA did not have the same provision.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1 Board Member Shelton asked what would happen if a project changed its use and he was informed
2 that the legislation was ambiguous. Board Member Shelton noted the City Hall use had been
3 changed when the Arts Council office moved out of City Hall. It was noted there were still a few
4 art classes in the building. Mr. Burningham responded they had more aggregate expenses than
5 they did in haircut monies. Board Member Shelton clarified it was more about grouping the
6 expense.

7
8 Mr. Burningham continued by explaining the traditional tax collection had expired for East Main
9 Street. The haircut increment would extend the collection for an additional seven years. He noted
10 growth had been significant on 200 East and Main Street. Most of the 29 acres were developed
11 and the City was getting appreciation. There were eight undeveloped acres in the North Valley.
12 The City had one more year of tax increment and seven years of the haircut increments. He
13 explained the RDA was still owed \$136,000 in delinquent taxes. He noted they had given Young
14 Living some assistance to develop the old CAL Ranch building and it turned into a good
15 investment. The Egg Farm EDA had been successful and the City was currently collecting
16 \$901,000 in tax increment. The tax increment would be capped by 2024. He said the City
17 continued to have industrial flex space that created jobs.

18
19 Board Member Shelton asked if there was a timeline for the capital improvement projects. Mr.
20 Burningham responded they had recommended a capital facility plan for the RDA. He said there
21 would be a lot of revenue and the City would need to prioritize and plan its projects. Board
22 Member Shelton asked how they would begin this process. Mr. Burningham responded this would
23 be a three- to four-month process. He said they needed to identify their priorities and solidify their
24 plan with the Patriot Station. Board Member Shelton expressed concerns about the commitments
25 the City had made. Mr. Burningham stated that it was the appropriate time to prioritize projects
26 and plan resources accordingly. The report could include information detailing where to prioritize
27 certain projects. Board Member Shelton suggested they include in the plan how they would use
28 the tax funds and when projects would be completed.

29
30 Mr. Burningham explained the report was not formally adopted. They would consider it accepted
31 by the RDA Board and would subsequently make any changes necessary. The report would then
32 be submitted on behalf of the City. Board Member Shelton noted there was an error in the report.
33 He said the traffic light was at 300 East not 200 East. He stated that they needed to push for the
34 capital improvement plan.

35
36 **Board Member Shelton moved to accept the 2018 RDA annual report with the change on the**
37 **200 East to 300 East light and to add language in concerning a capital improvement plan.**
38 **Board Member Taylor seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

39	Board Member Barnes	Aye
40	Board Member Carroll	Aye
41	Board Member Christiansen	Aye
42	Board Member Shelton	Aye
43	Board Member Taylor	Aye

44
45 3. Review and discussion on the proposed Patriot Station Community Reinvestment Area
46 (CRA).

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1 4. Discussion on an interlocal agreement with Utah County regarding the creation of the
2 Patriot Station CRA.

3 5. Discussion and action on a resolution indicating the City's intent to study the American
4 Fork City Transportation Reinvestment Zone (TRZ).

5 Items #3, #4, and #5 were discussed together.
6

7 Mr. Burningham said the intent was to include this resolution with the TOD zone. There were
8 areas that had not been annexed into the City. He explained the funds for the area were mostly for
9 public infrastructure, transportation, and utilities. Some of the funds were set aside for housing
10 development and project area administration. He said staff had worked on a proposition to fund
11 the areas with public assistance if the development failed. The land uses of the area were primarily
12 agricultural. This did not force anyone to develop but would be an immediate benefit if it was to
13 be developed. He said there was a need for an interlocal agreement because most of the area was
14 in unincorporated Utah County.
15

16 Board Member Shelton clarified they were doing a CRA and a TRZ and each would have their
17 own budgets. Mr. Burningham responded in the affirmative. He said it made more sense to have
18 the two because the TRZ expected sales and income taxes, whereas the CRA did not.
19

20 Board Member Barnes asked if there was an overlap of the two zones. Mr. Burningham answered
21 in the affirmative, which he then identified using the aid of an aerial map. He explained the funding
22 sources were different between the two entities.
23

24 Board Member Shelton asked why the area was so large. Mr. Burningham responded they were
25 surveying these boundaries, but the actual area would be dictated by other agencies. Board
26 Member Shelton asked if the project area gave them enough resources to include the I-15 flyover.
27 Mr. Burningham responded everything not in the transit core would be residential in the TOD,
28 which provided an idea of where the fly over would be located. Board Member Shelton said the
29 flyover would be expensive. He suggested including the project area with the flyover to mitigate
30 the costs. Mr. Bunker responded the area was drawn to include any commercial businesses. Mr.
31 Burningham explained that where the money was captured was not the same as where the money
32 was spent.
33

34 Board Member Shelton asked what the limitations were for spending the raised taxes. Mr.
35 Burningham responded they needed to be spent on regionally significant transportation projects.
36 This would all be approved by an interlocal agreement, which would allow the City to include
37 unincorporated areas into the boundaries.
38

39 Chairman Frost asked if there was any other City creating a TRZ. Mr. Burningham responded in
40 the negative; however, Sandy and South Jordan considered a TRZ for the construction of a
41 pedestrian walkway over I-15.
42

43 Board Member Taylor asked what type of motion they needed on the resolution. Mr. Burningham
44 explained that if the Board was comfortable with the interlocal agreement, a meeting with the
45 County would be scheduled to discuss plans. Staff wanted the TRZ resolution to be adopted so
46 they could move forward with UDOT and other entities.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Board Member Barnes asked about the annexed properties in the report, and stated that the language was confusing. Board Member Taylor suggested they move forward with the document. Board Member Barnes stated that he preferred the RDA to resolve questions before the document was presented to the County. Mr. Burningham agreed that the wording needed to be corrected.

Board Member Shelton explained that the property owners had made promises with very little being accomplished. He said this was a large area with an interlocal agreement that could be problematic if the economy fell. They preferred annexing the areas successfully before promising tax breaks. Mr. Burningham stated that the interlocal agreement did not obligate the entities in the way Board Member Shelton was anticipating.

Board Member Carroll asked if they would give the annexed areas tax breaks if they were still a part of the County. Mr. Burningham answered in the negative. He said the RDA allowed them to create a project area that was not in the City. If they began to develop without the annexed areas, they would have inconsistent development. They needed the consent from the County to put a CRA on their property. Board Member Carroll said she was concerned about delaying the approval.

Board Member Shelton said he would vote no on any tax increment given to any property not annexed into the City. Mr. Burningham said they would not be given any tax increment unless they were a part of the City.

Board Member Taylor stated that they were not giving anything away. They were adopting the agreement to act when the time was right. He noted there was no action on the agreement in this meeting. Board Member Shelton said he did not object to moving forward.

Board Member Christiansen said annexation was a privilege and they would be prepared when it happened.

Mr. Burningham explained that the City was required to give notification to the public and the annexation process would be time consuming. He reiterated that the land owners were not forced to develop, but it did give them that option.

Chairman Frost said he was confident they had enough information to move forward.

Board Member Shelton asked how this compared to the Main Street CRA. Mr. Burningham responded the Main Street CRA was behind this project. He said they were currently working on the Main Street CRA. Board Member Shelton asked if going to the County with several projects was problematic. Mr. Burningham answered in the negative.

Board Member Carroll noted Main Street was included in the TRZ. She said she would like TRZ money to be used for Main Street improvements. Board Member Shelton said the funding mechanism were different between the CRA and the TRZ.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1 **Board Member Taylor moved to approve the resolution indicating the intent to study the**
2 **American Fork City Transportation Reinvestment Zone. Board Member Carroll seconded**
3 **the motion. Voting was as follows:**

4	Board Member Barnes	Aye
5	Board Member Carroll	Aye
6	Board Member Christiansen	Aye
7	Board Member Shelton	Aye
8	Board Member Taylor	Aye

9
10 Mr. Burningham commented that the State needed to fund these projects. He noted the area around
11 the airport was funded by the State and it had grown significantly.

12
13 6. Approval of the June 19, 2018 Redevelopment Agency Special Session Minutes
14 **Board Member Shelton moved to approve the May 8, 2018, Redevelopment Agency minutes.**
15 **Board Member Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

16	Board Member Barnes	Aye
17	Board Member Carroll	Aye
18	Board Member Christiansen	Aye
19	Board Member Shelton	Aye
20	Board Member Taylor	Aye

21
22 Board Member Barnes mentioned that he had a question on the minutes but he would get with Ms.
23 Lurker.

24
25 7. New Business

26 There was no new business to discuss.

27
28 8. Old Business

29 There was no old business to discuss.

30
31 9. Adjournment

32 **Board Member Taylor moved to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Christiansen**
33 **seconded the motion. All were in favor.**

34
35 The meeting ended at 7:35 p.m.