



**NOTICE OF A REDEVELOPMENT  
AGENCY BOARD MEETING  
June 9, 2026, at 6:00 PM**

---

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the Vineyard Redevelopment Agency Board will hold a regularly scheduled Redevelopment Agency Board meeting on Tuesday, June 9, 2026, at 6:00 PM, in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 125 South Main Street, Vineyard, UT. This meeting can also be viewed on our [live stream page](#).

**AGENDA**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. PRESENTATIONS, RECOGNITIONS, AWARDS, AND PROCLAMATIONS**

**2.1. Report from the RDA subcommittee regarding interviews with applicants for RDA Advisor positions.**

**3. CONSENT ITEMS**

**3.1. Approval of the April 28, 2026, RDA Meeting Minutes**

**3.2. Approval of the May 12, 2026, RDA Meeting Minutes**

**4. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**4.1. Approve the appointment of Kim Cornelius to serve as an RDA Advisor.**

**4.2. Approve the appointment of Keith Vincent to serve as an RDA Advisor**

**4.3. Approve the appointment of Jared Tamez to serve as an RDA Advisor.**

**5. CLOSED SESSION**

The Vineyard Redevelopment Agency Board, pursuant to Utah Code 52-4-205, may vote to go into a closed session for the purpose of personnel, real property, or litigation.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

RDA meetings are scheduled as necessary.

This meeting may be held in a way that will allow a board member to participate electronically.

The public is invited to participate in all RDA 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 prior to the meeting by calling (385) 338-5214.

I, the undersigned duly appointed City Recorder for Vineyard, Utah, hereby certify that the foregoing notice and agenda was posted at Vineyard City Hall, on the Vineyard City and Utah Public Notice websites, and delivered electronically to staff and to each member of the Governing Body.

**AGENDA NOTICING COMPLETED ON:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**CERTIFIED (NOTICED) BY:**

/s/Robin Bond

ROBIN BOND, CITY RECORDER



**MINUTES OF A REDEVELOPMENT  
AGENCY BOARD MEETING  
April 28, 2026, at 6:00 PM**

**Present**

Mayor Zack Stratton  
RDA Board Member Jacob Holdaway  
RDA Board Member David Lauret  
RDA Board Member Parker McCumber  
RDA Board Member Ezra Nair  
RDA Board Member Jacob Wood

**Staff Present:** Chief Deputy Holden Rockwell with the Utah County Sheriff's Office, Administrative Director David Kyle Herring, Finance Director Evan Smith, Building Director Cris Thomas, Parks and Recreation Director Brian Vawdrey, Wastewater Crew Lead Chris Jackson, Streets and Stormwater Manager Chris Thomas, Streets and Stormwater Crew Lead Clint Roundy, Environmental Utilities Operators Tyson Gerbach and Tony Tienda, Public Works Director Naseem Ghandour, Senior Planner Cache Hancey, City Recorder Robin Bond, and Deputy City Recorder Tony Lara


**Also Present:** Vineyard Residents David Pearce, Zack Hall and Daria Evans. Utah County resident Issac Paxman


**1. CALL TO ORDER**


Chair Stratton called the meeting to order at 7:11pm

**2. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**2.1. Approve Resolution RDA-2026-02 Hiring Up To Three Advisors For The RDA Board**

 **Motion: Board Member Lauret moved to adopt Resolution 2026-02 as presented. Board Member Wood seconded the motion. Yes: Board Members Holdaway, Lauret, McCumber, and Wood. No: Board Member Nair. Motion Passed 4-1.**

 Boardmember Holdaway introduced the resolution and provided context regarding the proposed resolution.

 Boardmember Nair stated that he felt the resolution needed additional clarity before passage, including having Chris Harding from CPA Insight Solutions to come and present on the needs the resolution was seeking to address. He asked that the item instead be continued so that additional work can be done, and additional information can be made public.

**3. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:18pm



**NOTICE OF A REDEVELOPMENT  
AGENCY BOARD MEETING  
May 12, 2026, at 6:00 PM**

**AGENDA**

Mayor Zack Stratton  
RDA Board Member Jacob Holdaway  
RDA Board Member David Lauret  
RDA Board Member Parker McCumber  
RDA Board Member Ezra Nair  
RDA Board Member Jacob Wood

**Staff Present:** Administrative Director David Herring; Chief Deputy Holden Rockwell of the Utah County Sheriff's Office (remotely); City Recorder Robin Bond; Deputy City Recorder Tony Lara (remotely); Parks and Recreation Director Brian Vawdrey; Public Works Director/City Engineer Naseem Ghandour and RDA Director Josh Daniels.


**Also Attending:** Daria Evans, Karen Cornelius, Kim Cornelius, Dennis Frank, Nathan Steele, Emmeline McCumber, Trinity Ewing, Brian Voeks, Jane Pearce, David Pearce, Darlene Price, and others who did not sign in or whose writing was illegible.

**Presiding Chair Zack Stratton**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Stratton called the meeting to order at 7:24 pm.

**2. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**2.1.  Adoption of Resolution U2026-03, commencing tax increment collection for parcels in the Geneva Urban Renewal Project Area**

RDA Director Josh Daniels presented on collecting the tax increment collection for parcels. He explained that undeveloped land that became developed land was more valuable. He talked about the certified tax rates. He talked about the downtown area. Tax shift was discussed for new development and existing buildings. He showed James Bay parcels and the phased developments. Orchards Area would be Phase 4.

Board Member Holdaway asked about the areas that were not triggered for collection. Mr. Daniels answered that some where public entities like parks or central Utah water which had a parcel.

Board Member Nair clarified that an area outside the RDA which could benefit from the RDA could be included such as the cooling ponds or a road or a right-of-way.

Board Member Lauret clarified that more businesses lowered the tax rate.

39  
40 Staff reviewed the process for triggering tax increment collection, which occurs annually  
41 following County property assessments (typically implemented in May). Triggering allows  
42 increased property value resulting from development to be captured as RDA increment rather  
43 than included in the City’s general tax base.

44  
45 Under Utah’s certified tax rate system, cities do not automatically receive increased property  
46 tax revenue; the rates adjust to keep base revenue stable. Additional value that would be  
47 created by development is classified as “new growth.”

48  
49 RDA increment: Captures and defers that new growth for a defined period (20–25 years  
50 depending on program). The best practice would be to trigger parcels as close as possible to the  
51 year they qualify as “new growth”.

52 Timing and smoothing strategy would be a phased approach to triggering properties and help  
53 balance annual new growth with increment capture, which reduces large future shifts when  
54 major project areas are triggered, and creates a long-term smoothing effect on tax revenues.

55 Project area development would be development that occurs incrementally through land  
56 subdivision, construction of improvements (residential/commercial), property valuation is  
57 determined as of January 1 each year. Significant new growth is currently occurring in  
58 Downtown/HTRZ (Housing and Transit Reinvestment Zone (such as Utah City)) area and is  
59 scheduled for increment triggering in 2028.

## 60 Resolutions Under Consideration

### 61 1. Phase 3C – James Bay

- 62 • Primarily residential development
- 63 • Includes open space and public parcels for tracking
- 64 • Development exceeds ~50% completion threshold

### 65 2. Phase 4B – Orchards

- 66 • Includes:
  - 67 ○ Completed structures
  - 68 ○ Active construction
  - 69 ○ Subdivided but unimproved lots
  - 70 ○ Adjacent commercial properties

## 71 Financial Overview

- 72 • Phase 3C: ~ \$40 million taxable value
- 73 • Phase 4B: ~ \$48 million taxable value
- 74 • Total Proposed Trigger: ~ \$90 million
- 75 • Comparable to:

76                   ○ Estimated ~\$90 million in new growth expected from HTRZ development

77   RDA Formation and Boundary Context

- 78           • Original RDA project area established through:
  - 79                   ○ Survey
  - 80                   ○ Blight determination
  - 81                   ○ Formal designation filings
  - 82                   ○ Adoption of project plan and budget
- 83           • Boundaries:
  - 84                   ○ Generally fixed as part of the adopted plan
- 85           • Recent Council actions:
  - 86                   ○ Did not alter boundaries, but allowed use of RDA funds outside the area if
  - 87                   deemed beneficial

88   The Board discussed the use of RDA funds and acknowledged that such funds may be used for  
89   infrastructure or improvements located outside the formal project area boundaries, provided  
90   those expenditures are determined to benefit the RDA. Members noted that while this  
91   flexibility is useful for supporting related development and connectivity, it also creates  
92   challenges in clearly defining the limits of eligible expenditures and may introduce ambiguity in  
93   determining what qualifies as a direct benefit to the RDA.

94   The Board also considered the balance between City revenue and RDA increment. It was noted  
95   that the City's goals include both maintaining sufficient operational funding and financing  
96   infrastructure through RDA increment. Historically, the City delayed triggering certain parcels in  
97   order to build its general property tax base and support operations. However, the current  
98   approach reflects a shift toward optimizing increment capture, recognizing that infrastructure  
99   needs and development timing now favor a more proactive triggering strategy.

100   In discussing the certified tax rate system, the Board expressed an understanding that new  
101   growth can temporarily reduce the tax burden on residents by increasing the overall tax base.  
102   However, once that growth is redirected into RDA increment through triggering, the City's  
103   taxable base is reduced, which may lead to higher tax rates to maintain revenue levels. Staff  
104   confirmed that this interpretation was accurate and consistent with how the system functions  
105   in practice.

106   The Board further discussed long-term fiscal considerations, particularly in relation to the scale  
107   of development in the Utah City area and the extended duration of layered increment periods  
108   under both the HTRZ and RDA programs. Staff clarified that the HTRZ increment will be applied  
109   first, with taxing entities retaining approximately 20 percent of tax revenues during that period,  
110   followed by the RDA increment phase. While this structure diverts revenue in the short and  
111   medium term, it allows for infrastructure to be funded upfront, with the expectation of a  
112   substantial revenue increase for the City and other taxing entities once both increment periods  
113   expire.

114 Finally, the Board addressed the risks associated with forecasting new growth. Members noted  
115 that the pace and scale of future development are inherently uncertain, and that financial  
116 modeling depends heavily on external development timing that is not fully within the City's  
117 control. Staff acknowledged these uncertainties and recommended continued reliance on  
118 County data, updated projections, and ongoing analysis to inform decision-making and mitigate  
119 forecasting risks.

120 Triggering strategy discussion ensued.

121 Options Considered:

- 122 1. Trigger all parcels (including unimproved lots)
- 123 2. Trigger only parcels with completed structures
- 124 3. Delay further analysis before final decision

125 Staff Recommendation:

- 126 • Trigger only parcels with completed structures
- 127 • Defer unimproved lots to future year when:
  - 128 ○ Improvements increase value
  - 129 ○ Additional new growth can be balanced


130 Timing Constraints

- 131 • County requires finalized data by late May (~May 26)
- 132 • Triggering outside that window provides no practical benefit for current tax year

133 Board Guidance

- 134 • Board expressed interest in:
  - 135 ○ Reviewing financial modeling before final decision
  - 136 ○ Understanding impact of triggering only improved parcels

137

138  Board Member Nair explained why some tax rates had not been triggered. It  
139 depended on what operational funds the City needed.

140 Mr. Daniels continued to explain tax shifting effects for commercial parcels. In the Geneva  
141 Retailer Tax shift effect occurs when new growth is first added to the City's tax base, and later  
142 removed when increment is triggered. The results would be upward pressure on tax rates for  
143 remaining taxpayers. Staff emphasized the importance of timely triggering to prevent future  
144 fiscal imbalances.

145 Mr. Daniels asked which the Board would recommend. Would they like to trigger all  
146 parcels that had structures, or all parcels in the phase?


147

148 Council Member McCumber asked if it could only be triggered in May. Mr. Daniels said  
149 the County needed to know which parcels would be triggered by the end of May.


150


151 Discussion ensued. Council Member Holdaway would like to see all the parcels that are  
152 built on be triggered. Mr. Daniels said each phase would trigger all parcels in that phase  
153 at the same time. Board Member Holdaway wanted a tax auditor to be involved in the  
154 RDA.

155

156  Board Member Nair talked about the benefits of the RDA for the future and for  
157 infrastructure being put in quickly.

158

159  Board Member McCumber asked for a revenue and expenses chart.

160  Mayor Stratton reported on several payments for reimbursement. Board Member  
161 Lauret stated that if they were held more than 60 days, they should be paid. Board  
162 Member Holdaway wanted everything put on hold. Board Member Lauret asked if new  
163 invoices could be held.

164 **Motion: Board Member Lauret motioned to continue Resolution 2026-03 about tax**  
165 **increment collection for Geneva Urban Renewal project area for two weeks until they**  
166 **can receive the requested information. Second: Board Member Holdaway. Yes: Board**  
167 **Members, Holdaway, Lauret, McCumber, Nair, and Wood. Motion Passed 5-0.**

168

169 Additional discussion about Environmental Remediation Payments continued.

## 170 Background

- 171 • Outstanding remediation invoices totaling approximately:
  - 172 ○ \$2.7M–\$3.0M
- 173 • Some invoices pending beyond standard review timeframe

## 174 Council Direction

- 175 • Payments:
  - 176 ○ Approved payment of all existing, valid invoices
- 177 • Future Work:
  - 178 ○ Do not halt property owner activity, legally the Board cannot restrict the
  - 179 property owner.
  - 180 ○ Instead:
    - 181 ▪ Delay acceptance of new invoices temporarily
    - 182 ▪ Implement improved verification procedures, documentation
    - 183 standards, and Invoicing requirements

## 184 Process Improvements Identified

- 185 • Establish:
  - 186 ○ Formal verification of completed work
  - 187 ○ Clear documentation expectations
  - 188 ○ Internal review controls
- 189 • Staff to coordinate with:
  - 190 ○ Auditor
  - 191 ○ RDA specialists
  - 192 ○ County representatives

193 **Financial Transparency and Reporting**

- 194 • Request made for:
  - 195 ○ Regular year-to-date financial reporting (P&L-style summary)
- 196 • Staff confirmed:
  - 197 ○ Existing multi-year data available
  - 198 ○ Additional reporting to be provided
- 199 • Ongoing actions:
  - 200 ○ Compilation of historical financial records
  - 201 ○ Engagement of RDA specialists for modeling and solvency review

202 **Key Takeaways from this meeting included the following:**

- 203 • Timely triggering is critical to:
  - 204 ○ Prevent tax shift effects
  - 205 ○ Maintain fiscal balance
- 206 • Current strategy:
  - 207 ○ Focus on improved parcels first
  - 208 ○ Phase additional increment over time
- 209 • Financial oversight and modeling:
  - 210 ○ Identified as priority before final action
- 211 • Infrastructure funding model:
  - 212 ○ Relies heavily on RDA/HTRZ participation and interagency contributions

213 **3. ADJOURNMENT**

214 The meeting was adjourned at 8:18 pm.

215

216 **MINUTES APPROVED ON:**

217

218

219 **CERTIFIED BY:**

220

221

222

---

---

ROBIN BOND, CITY RECORDER