



**ROY CITY**  
**Roy City RDA Meeting Minutes**  
**September 20, 2022 – 5:30 p.m.**  
Roy City Council Chambers  
5051 South 1900 West

Minutes of the Roy City Redevelopment Agency Board Meeting held in the City Council Chambers of the Roy City Municipal Building on September 20, 2022, at 8:29 PM

Notice of the meeting was provided to the Utah Public Notice Website at least 24 hours in advance. A copy of the agenda was posted to the Roy City Website.

The following members were in attendance:

Chairman Robert Dandoy  
Board member Jackson  
Board member Joe Paul  
Board member Scadden  
Board member Sophie Paul  
Board member Wilson

City Attorney, Andy Blackburn

Also present were: Assistant City Manager, Brody Flint; City Manager, Matt Andrews; City Recorder, Brittany Fowers; Randy Sant, Glenda Moore, and Kevin Homer.

**A. Welcome & Roll Call**

Chairman Dandoy welcomed those in attendance and noted Board members Jackson, Joe Paul, Scadden, Sophie Paul, and Wilson were present.

**B. Discussion Items**

1. Discussion and consideration of approval of a request from Dilly Dally's for relocation funding.

Chairman Dandoy gave a history of the item, and noted the RDA board members had each received a letter requesting compensation for relocation from Dilly Dallys. He explained Roy City Council had previously reviewed a Planning Commission recommendation for the rezone and authorization of the mixed use developments within the downtown commercial area, known as Chapter 13 in their current standing ordinance. He recalled Dilly Dallys had been one of the first businesses impacted by this zoning change and had needed to be incorporated into a CRA. Chairman Dandoy said the property owner at the time had not been willing to issue Dilly Dallys a long term lease, and a City Council decision made in October of that year indicated the need for more time to assess the Chapter 13 document, and required a survey to be conducted. He further elaborated as storefront space was limited in the downtown area, Dilly Dallys was running out of options to find a future business location. Chairman Dandoy explained the Dilly Dallys had been concerned about the future of their business, and so they felt they needed to secure a new business location six months before their current lease ran out. He said this decision had been costly for them as the Dilly Dallys had needed to pay both their old and current lease, plus the costs of moving. Chairman Dandoy further reported that in the spring the City Council had approved Chapter 13, and explained Dilly Dallys was now requesting compensation for having been forced to move location from one part of Roy City to another. He asked the board members how they wanted to move forward.

Randy Sant outlined the relocation policy which had been adopted by the City. He noted the policy had



**ROY CITY**  
**Roy City RDA Meeting Minutes**  
**September 20, 2022 – 5:30 p.m.**  
Roy City Council Chambers  
5051 South 1900 West

been adopted by resolution by the RDA board. He stated that per the document, the maximum amount of financial assistance the City could give to a business impacted by relocation was \$75,000, and the maximum amount of any grant should not exceed \$15,000. He also listed the requirements for a business to qualify for any grant funding, which included that the business had to be located within an adopted redevelopment project area, the business had to remain in Roy City, and the reason for relocation had to be because of a redevelopment project approved by the Roy City RDA, and no other funding or assistance had been offered. Mr. Sant clarified the RDA board had not yet approved the Woodbury project. He explained the City Staff was reviewing things with the developer of that project, but the project had not yet come before the RDA board for formal approval. He also clarified there was no other funding available in this case, but if there was, the business was required to apply for other forms of aid before coming before the RDA. Mr. Sant explained the business would be required to submit a bid which confirmed the cost of the relocation process. He also noted the business might be required to sign an affidavit that stated they would only use the funds for the cost of relocation. He lastly noted the business would also be required to remain in Roy City for a certain amount of time, and if they were to leave the City before the end of the specified time they might be required to repay some of the funds had been received.

Board Member Wilson asked if the request should be tabled since it was in process and presumably at some point Dilly Dallys would meet all of these requirements. Mr. Sant said he only wanted to clarify that all of the requirements had to be met in order for the business to receive funding. Chairman Dandoy pointed out there was no expectation that the RDA would meet in regards to this project, and Mr. Sant explained that was correct. Mr. Sant elaborated the developers for the Woodbury project would only go to the RDA board if they were looking for TIF funding, and he noted that while nothing was official yet, he had spoken with the developers and they had indicated they wanted to request TIF funding. Mr. Sant said that based on his conversations with the developers, they would come to the RDA board for a TIF, but he did not have a sense of their timeline.

Chairman Dandoy asked how the RDA board could address the relocation expense. Mr. Sant said they could go back and change their policy if they needed to, and he explained the reasoning as to why the policy was worded in the way it was. He recalled there had been a lot of discussion about businesses that were impacted by road projects, so they had to make sure it specified funding could be for a project approved for funding by the State or a development agency, which would take care of the issue of UDOT projects. Mr. Sant clarified they only had the right to make any suggestions if they wanted to give it a tax increment, which is what gave them the discretion to review those projects. Chairman Dandoy said he did not understand what the RDA's interest would be in a business that was funded by UDOT. He thought the only interest the RDA would have in that business would be keeping it within Roy City limits. Mr. Sant agreed that was correct, and said the RDA would be able to offer relocation funds to that business to move them inside Roy City limits, but only as long as the business was being impacted by a State project.

Mr. Sant explained in the case of Dilly Dallys, they had gone to the property owner, who had told them they could not have a multi-year lease since they wanted the property to be available for a new development which was more in line with what the City wanted as far as the Chapter 13 rezone was concerned. He said while Dilly Dallys had not been kicked out as a result of the RDA, they had made their move as a direct result of the rezone. He stated Dilly Dallys had moved six months before the end of their lease, and so their request initially had been for funding assistance to help cover the cost of paying two leases at a time. Board Member Jackson added that she had spoken with Dilly Dallys owner, and they had explained January was their slowest time of year, so they had opted to move then, rather



**ROY CITY**  
**Roy City RDA Meeting Minutes**  
**September 20, 2022 – 5:30 p.m.**  
Roy City Council Chambers

than July as it was a much busier time for them and 5051 S would be a harder order to manage. Mr. Sant said they also had had to move as soon as a good new location was available.

Chairman Dandoy summarized that the challenge now was determining if those things would have happened anyway if the RDA had not been working on the Chapter 13 rezone, or been in talks with Woodbury about other developments. Chairman Dandoy pointed out the Chapter 13 project had ended up being delayed several months as a result of both the survey and impacts from the Covid-19 pandemic. Chairman Dandoy reported he had spoken with Jeff Woodbury, as had Mr. Sant, and he said they had everything worked out and their plans would have gone ahead, if not for the delay of Chapter 13. Chairman Dandoy said Dilly Dallys had claimed they had spent \$29,000 in moving costs alone, and they had spent about \$80,000 in all. Chairman Dandoy pointed out the most Dilly Dallys could hope to get from the RDA was only \$15,000, which was a fraction of their costs. He said Dilly Dallys had been a business in Roy City for a long time, and said if not for the actions of the RDA board, Dilly Dallys would still be in its original location. Chairman Dandoy said they needed to do everything they could to protect their businesses and keep them in Roy City.

Mr. Sant agreed with Chairman Dandoy's sentiments, but said that the difference now was that Woodbury was initiating a project; it was not being initiated by the City or the State. Mr. Sant recalled Woodburys had come to them with the idea for the project and had asked for help in filling in the gaps, and so his recommendation at the time had been to create the Southeast project area. Board Member Jackson asked if Dilly Dallys had filled out an application for that project area, and Mr. Sant replied they had. Board Member Jackson then opined they needed to vote on if they wanted to give them \$15,000 or not. Mr. Sant confirmed \$15,000 was the maximum amount they could give to Dilly Dallys. The Board Members discussed the key point was whether or not the project was approved by the RDA, as was specified in the policy. Chairman Dandoy argued this did not make sense, since the only reason the RDA would approve a project was in regards to tax increment funding. Mr. Sant acknowledged there was ambiguity in the phrasing of the adopted policy, and said if they wanted to change it they could.

Board Member Jackson felt they should give Dilly Dallys \$15,000, since they had moved as a result of the redevelopment. She said the business owners had been in Roy City for over 30 years, and thought this had been a bad deal for them. Board Member Joe Paul disagreed, and thought Dilly Dallys had made an objective business decision to pick up and move, and felt they had made the best choice for their business given the information available to them at the time. Board Member Wilson thought this was cut and dry, and thought it came down to the interpretation of the policy. She asked who would be responsible for the interpretation of the document, and Mr. Sant explained that was the Board's prerogative.

Chairman Dandoy thought the larger question was if they needed to modify their policy. Chairman Dandoy pointed out the policy dealt more with the developers rather than the business which were actually being impacted. He said they now had a project which had been approved by the Planning Commission, and reminded the Board Members that the purpose of their conversation that evening was just to have a discussion, not to make a decision. He thought the intent of the policy was to try and address the issue of business which were impacted by the RDA. He opined they address the issues with the policy first, and said they needed to change the policy before they made a decision about Dilly Dallys or the Woodbury development. He commended Mr. Sant for clarifying the wording of the policy, and he reiterated his opinion that the wording of the policy lost the intent of what they wanted to accomplish. Chairman Dandoy felt Dilly Dallys had not had a choice of if they needed to move or not, and thought they should be able to at least reimburse some of the costs they had been forced to take on.



**ROY CITY**  
**Roy City RDA Meeting Minutes**  
**September 20, 2022 – 5:30 p.m.**  
Roy City Council Chambers

Chairman Dandoy also discussed the purpose of 5051 South 1900 West said the RDA could use tax increment to help encourage business relocation, expansion, and development. He discussed in the last ten years, the RDA board had not invested money back into businesses, and they had \$1.6 Million dollars in RDA funds that were not being utilized for projects. City Manager Andrews argued they had done a lot of utility work at the Albertsons, but agreed other than that their funds had mainly been used for smaller projects. Board Member Joe Paul said they had talked about a lot of projects, but not a lot had actually gotten done. Chairman Dandoy continued to say their funds continued to accumulate, and yet there were no projects going on to show for it. Board Member Joe Paul thought they had not had the right project come along yet to deserve their available funds. Chairman Dandoy agreed with Board Member Joe Paul, and reiterated that he thought the main thing they needed to do was reevaluate their policy. Chairman Dandoy also spoke about what they would do if Dilly Dallys came to the RDA for a TIF, since they did meet all of the requirements.

Board Member Joe Paul agreed with Chairman Dandoy that they needed to have two separate conversations; one about the policy and then one about Dilly Dallys in particular. Board Member Wilson asked about the timeline, and Mr. Sant explained Dilly Dallys had already submitted their application, so they might have to be grandfathered into whatever the Board decided on. Mr. Sant asked if it would be the Board's preference that they start this conversation with the Economic Development Committee who could come back to the Board with recommendations, and the RDA Board agreed that would be the best course of action.

Chairman Dandoy repeated that they needed to look at the correlation between the TIF and a business which had been forcibly moved by an RDA project area. He said if they got a TIF, they would technically be in compliance with the policy. Mr. Sant discussed the RDA and the City were two separate entities with separate budgets, and so if the money were to come out of the City, then the Council would have to decide to fund it. Mr. Sant added this was the third version of the project, and they could always choose to change it again. Mr. Sant said in his view, they did not have an approved project since it had not officially come before the RDA board. He elaborated they did not have the right to request specifications from the developer, since it was not under their jurisdiction until the developer came before the RDA to ask for a TIF. Mr. Sant said he had spoken with City Planner Steve Parkinson about the project, who had reported the developer was still in an early stage of the project. Mr. Sant explained once the RDA gave the project money, they would be able to set guidelines for the project.

**Board member Scadden motioned to adjourn. Board member Wilson seconded the motion. All Board members voted "aye". The board adjourned at 9:15 p.m.**