

## **OLYMPIA WORKING GROUP SUMMARY MASTER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**

**Date:** September 9, 2021

**Time:** 8:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

**Attendees:** Steve Shields, Clint Smith, Nathan Cherpeski, Tami Moody, Wendy Thomas, Chase Andrizzi, Blake Thomas, Justun Edwards, Michael Maloy, Olympia Development Team

In this meeting, the group identified key issues in the master development agreement (MDA) to discuss in the upcoming September 15<sup>th</sup> special City Council work meeting. The group initially spent some discussion time making sure that all necessary procedural items (MDA, annexation, public infrastructure districts, etc.) are being properly addressed in the appropriate order with the desired public outreach. This included a discussion about a potential referendum “clock,” which was discussed in the previous night’s City Council meeting. A memorandum will be sent out in coming days detailing the potential “clock.”

The group discussed two main topics to be addressed with the full City Council in next week’s meeting: commercial space preservation requirements and open space amenities. First, the group discussed the commercial space preservation requirement of 300,000 square feet, and asked to have background information justifying that number prepared for discussion at the Sept. 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. It was mentioned that the developer has had conversations with commercial brokers, but more details will be available next week at the meeting. It was again emphasized that the development team and the City will need to combine voices to lobby for the intersection of U-111 and 12600 South to occur in the project area to help facilitate a major retail center.

The group again discussed that even without the major intersection, though, there is still room and a definite need for some commercial uses within the project, including employment opportunities and supporting neighborhood commercial. The group has included a provision in the MDA to address that scenario, reducing the requirement to a proposed 100,000 sq. ft if the intersection ultimately falls outside Olympia.

Open space was the next main topic. It was noted that the MDA should include clear language explaining why some areas would or would not count 100% toward the open space requirement if it is contained on unbuildable slopes. It was mentioned that the Salt Lake County MDA allows such areas to count 100% toward open space requirements.

The group also discussed programmable open space within the project and acknowledged some public comments from community members desiring programmable space. The project has areas large enough for programmable sports fields and some of those areas, such as the park along 6400 West, are intended for those uses. The group mentioned those items should be highlighted in the

MDA and pointed out to the community. The group also discussed the idea of consolidating medium-sized parks for a larger park or two within the community. That idea will be discussed in more depth later.

There were two other issues discussed after the main items—6400 West and secondary water. Regarding 6400 West, the City has previously existing obligations to construct 6400 West southward from 12600 South through Creek Ridge. The group discussed the City paying for that project via offsetting costs credits for future impacts by Olympia, but talked about the difficulty of matching up the value of today's money with the future money of whatever those credits are covering. The group discussed instead entering a standard reimbursement agreement for that single project and suggested having a specific time backstop to make sure the developer isn't waiting for reimbursement indefinitely.

Regarding secondary water, there was a concern brought up that if secondary water lines are installed, they may sit empty and uncharged for a long time if the City isn't able to get a secondary water source on location. The question was asked how quickly the City would be able to charge those water lines and if it's worth requiring secondary water infrastructure. The reason this was asked is because of 1) the relatively few lots over 6,500 square feet (ordinance requires secondary lines for over 6,500 sq. ft.) and 2) if schools or other larger-scale land uses aren't provided charged secondary water lines upon construction, they may only install and use culinary sprinkler systems, which are set up differently than secondary systems. The group also acknowledged that the Olympia project will follow the City's water efficiency standards and have a large amount of xeriscape across the area. The group decided the question is essentially whether secondary water will be required for the project at all, and decided to await the full City Council's input before discussing further.

A draft MDA will be updated and distributed ahead of next Wednesday's special City Council work meeting.