Minutes of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray meeting held Tuesday, January 18, 2005 in the Murray City Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Attendance:

Mayor Dan Snarr	Bob Fisher	Gaylen Jorgensen	Mike Neil
Patricia Griffiths	Chris Waterman	J.H. Wright	Mogie DeMann
Krista Dunn	Cindy Carroll	Jacob Santini	Noel Anderson
Robert Robertson	D. Barney	Jared Mallory	Pat Moller
Jeff Dredge	Dan Checketts	Jay Bollwinkel	Patty Bennett
Jim Brass	Daniel Brinton	Jennifer Brass	S. Hardy
Carol Heales	Dave Wilde	Jerry Johnson	Saul Tukuafu
Shannon Jacobs	Dean Howes	Jim Prindiville	Scot Woodbury
Frank Nakamura	Dick Stauffer	Joe Rangel	Scott Baker
Keith Snarr	Don Patton	Josh Ewing	T. Orden Yost
Joshua Yost	Doug Baxter	Judy Beaudoin	Theodore Daw
Alice Steiner	Doug Black	Judy Tukuafu	Tom Henry
Karen Wikstrom	E. Barney	Karen Snarr	Tom Love
Jody Burnett	Eric Salsbery	Katherine Green	Trey Fitz Gerald
Art LaFeber	Fabian Zullo	Lee Brinton	
B. Simpson	Floyd Armstrong	Mike Carroll	
Blaine Benard	Gary Reimer	Mike Mallory	

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m. by Redevelopment Agency Chairperson Pat Griffiths.

Pat Griffiths, Chair:

The minutes should show that this is the time and date set for the continuation of a joint blight and public input hearing, including a proposed amendment to exclude a portion of the 1977 Central Business District Redevelopment Project Area and amend the boundaries of the Fireclay Survey Area, conducted by the Murray City Municipal Council and the Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City on Tuesday, January 18, 2005, at 5:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers of the Murray City Center located at 5025 S. State Street, Murray City, Utah.

A couple of housekeeping items; if anyone has cell phones we would request that you put them on silent mode or turn them off so we don't have disruption by cell phones during the meeting. Also we call your attention to the comment forms which are on your chairs which explain what business we will be conducting tonight. Please fill out the information following the instructions on the form and give those to Shannon Jacobs or Josh Yost.

To begin these proceedings tonight, I would like to introduce our City Attorney, Frank Nakamura, who will make some introductory remarks.

1. Review of November 9 hearing and purpose of hearing continuation.

Frank Nakamura:

As the chair stated this is a continuation of the joint blight and public input hearing that the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City and the Murray City Municipal Council conducted on November 9, 2004. The determination of blight is a prerequisite to the creation of a Redevelopment Project Area. A public hearing is a prerequisite to the preparation of a redevelopment project area plan.

As a reminder to us all and for the benefit of those who did not have an opportunity to attend that hearing, the Board of Directors for the Agency received the Revised Blight Analysis of Richard D. Chong and Associates, dated October 28, 2004, as well as submissions consisting of a combination of objections and comments from a number of property owners, which are included as part of the record. Copies of those written materials have been provided to members of the Board. Mr. Richard Chong was then called as a witness by Jody Burnett on behalf of the Agency to present evidence on the existence or non-existence of blight in the proposed Redevelopment Project Area. Following Mr. Chong's testimony, record owners of property located within the proposed Redevelopment Project Area, or their representatives, were given an opportunity to examine or cross-examine Mr. Chong regarding his study and to present any evidence and testimony concerning the existence or non-existence of blight. Several property owners or their representatives and members of the general public offered testimony and comment during the course of those proceedings. Unfortunately, because of time constraints posed by a full City Council agenda later that evening, the hearing could not be concluded. In addition, there is a need to amend the boundaries of a prior project area to delete some overlapping areas that are within the Fireclay Survey Area and to further revise the boundaries of the proposed Fireclay Redevelopment Project Area to delete properties that are located in unincorporated Salt Lake County. To summarize, the purpose of tonight's meeting is to allow additional property owners or their representatives, or representatives of any taxing entities to provide testimony or other evidence as to the existence or the non existence of blight in the Fireclay Survey Area, who did not have the opportunity to make those presentations at the November 9 meeting. This is also an opportunity to inform the public about a proposed redevelopment survey area and provide property owners in the area an opportunity to provide us their plans for the future and development of this proposed Fireclay Survey Area. For a combination of these reasons, the combined blight and public input hearing was continued to this evening along with the hearing on the proposal to amend the boundaries of the Fireclay Survey Area.

Notice of the continuation of the combined blight and public input hearing together with the proposal to amend the boundaries of the Fireclay Survey Area have been sent by certified mail to each assessment owner of property located within the proposed project area, and each assessment owner of property located outside but within 300 feet of the proposed project area. Notices have also been sent to the State Tax Commission, the Salt Lake County Assessor and Auditor, the State Board of Education, the Murray School

District, and the legislative body or governing body of each taxing entity within the proposed project area. Notice has also been published in a newspaper of general circulation once a week for four successive weeks immediately preceding this hearing.

The purpose of tonight's hearing is:

(1) to allow any additional property owners or their representatives, representatives of any taxing entities, and members of the general public to present testimony or comments on the existence or non-existence of blight to the Board of the Agency who did not have an opportunity to do so at the November 9th hearing;

(2) to inform the public about the area being considered for a redevelopment project area and allow public input into agency deliberations on the proposed redevelopment project area, including an opportunity for any other property owners or their representatives to advise the Board of the Agency on their plans for future use and development of their property that did not have an opportunity to do so at the November 9th hearing; and

(3) to allow public comment on the proposal to amend the boundaries of the Fireclay Survey Area to delete some overlapping areas that were included in the 1977 Central Business District and delete properties that are located in unincorporated Salt Lake County.

Pat Griffiths

I'd now like to introduce Karen Wikstrom whom we have hired as a consultant to the Redevelopment Agency, for some introductory remarks. She'll address the purpose of the public input hearing, preparation of a project area plan and other steps in the redevelopment process.

Karen, before you begin there is something else that I've overlooked. Frank mentioned that there were a few revisions in the revised blight study that Mr. Chong noted at the last hearing and I'd like to ask Mr. Jody Burnett, our attorney for the RDA, to present an erratum on those items.

Karen Wikstrom

My name is Karen Wikstrom and I am with Wikstrom Economic and Planning Consultants. We are a consultant to the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City. The Agency has asked me to go through a few of the basic steps that we will go through, should the board determine that there is blight in the Fireclay Survey Area this evening.

What I'm going to do is talk about the basic planning process for developing a redevelopment project area plan and we are about 10 months into the process. The general process begins with the creation of a survey area and in this case that was on April 13, 2004, nearly a year ago. In May, Richard Chong and Associates began the blight study of the area. That's the critical step in determining if a project meets blight criteria and can therefore qualify as a redevelopment project area. We are here tonight on a continuation of the blight hearing that began, as Frank said, on

November 9. The blight hearing wraps up that first step of a redevelopment process which is a blight survey and determining whether blight exists or not. Combined with that, the Board is holding a public input hearing. What that means is that they're asking property owners and the general public for information and ideas about plans for the Fireclay Survey Area. I've brought a map, generally the area we're talking about is between the D&RGW railroad tracks and State Street, the northern Murray City boundaries and 4500 South. The area contains about 100 acres. In our last meeting we heard from a number of property owners who were telling us what their plans are for their properties are in the future and that helps us as we move forward in determining plans for the 100 acre site.

Our firm has been hired to work with the Agency to develop that plan. Part of our team is Landmark Design and Jan Streifel the principal owner of Landmark Design is here to listen tonight to what you all have to say. Its important to understand the process began last April and we are continuing with this blight hearing from November 9th. No plan is in place. If the RDA Board makes a finding of blight it can the authorize the preparation of a plan. If they so determine tonight, then we will move forward and develop a plan. If no finding of blight is made, the whole process stops right now, that is the critical juncture. If that determination is made, one of the first steps is a public input hearing, which we're holding tonight and that is something that the statute provides for, that a blight hearing and a public input hearing can be held concurrently. After that, there would be the preparation of the master plan for the project. That's like a small area master plan, it identifies land uses, and it's a very specific plan for the area, and its done in coordination with the Planning Commission, the property owners, and with the public, as we identify the goals for the project area and how the City working as a Redevelopment Agency would work towards the implementation of those goals in the plan. As the city identifies what its role can be, it identifies a budget, what kinds of public investment would be needed to implement the plan. That gets translated into the Redevelopment Area Budget. That budget will have to be approved by the taxing agencies that would be impacted by the creation of a redevelopment project area. Then there will be public hearings on both the project area plan and budget. That sounds like a very cumbersome process, but it is something that can happen over the course of the next two to six months. Again, this is a project where the plan hasn't been created. We're listening to you tonight to hear what ought to happen in the project area, as well as your thoughts on blight. A big part of tonight's hearing is what do you think about the Fireclay Project Area and what should we be taking into account as we move forward in the development of the plan. I know you've heard about plans for the project area, but nothing's in place. Really what we have is a blank open slate. We're here to hear from you. We have taken copious notes from the November 9th hearing and we're very anxious to hear from those who haven't had a chance to speak yet. The next steps would be after the public hearing on the plan and the budget the RDA Board and the City Council have to adopt the plan. Then they will issue an RFP or an RFQ, which means a request for proposals or a request for qualifications. They'll select developers for the project, there may be one, or there may be multiple developers. Then the RDA and the developers will jointly implement the plan.

2. Open the Public Hearing

Pat Griffiths, Chair:

Thank you Karen, I thought that was very well explained in her presentation. We appreciate our consultants who have a great deal of expertise on which we rely.

I'd like to acknowledge receipt of some written comments that we've received. I have one that was received from Bob Fisher of Utah Property Rights Association dated December 8 and we'll enter that into the record. Before we begin the public hearing, I'd like to request that Ms. Jacobs serve as a time keeper for me during the meeting.

The Chair now invites any record owners of property within the proposed Redevelopment Project Area or their representatives, or representatives of any taxing entities or members of the general public who did not have an opportunity address the Board at the November 9th hearing, to present any evidence and testimony they may wish the Board to consider concerning the existence or non-existence of blight. In order to accommodate your friends and neighbors who may wish to be heard and in recognition of the fact that we as a Board have copies of all of the written materials and the benefit of having heard the presentation on November 9, 2004, we would ask that you not simply repeat information or comments that have already been presented and try to limit your remarks to three minutes, five minutes for a spokesperson for a larger group.

Tony Rezack
5868 South Bullion Street. My questions are "Have there been any environmental studies?" That used to be an old smelter there. "What funding is it going to take to solve those issues there?" Also, "Has there been a feasibility study made on the project. Is the program put together for a full economic value of who is participating and what its costing to do these issues?"

As far as a sports field, I've been involved in several programs in Murray City and I would like to see something like this happen, but I would like to have those answers on that before anything else goes on.

Pat Griffiths
Now, this is on whether or not there is existence or non-existence of blight in the area and I'd like you to restrict your statements to that.

Mr. Delyn Barney, are your comments regarding the blight factor?

Delyn Barney
My mother and I own property and a home in Murray where we've lived for the last 40 years. Whether or not this area was blighted in 1982 or is now, our home is worth a lot more than money. We are opposed to the redevelopment plans, plans that can be used to force people out of their homes with eminent domain. We have seen the destruction of downtown Murray City with the building of Fashion Place Mall. This happened while I was in Japan in the Marine Corps. They built the Fashion Place Mall and downtown Murray City disappeared, which could be classified as blight. Also with the expansion of Vine Street, more of downtown was destroyed and people forced out of their homes and off their property. It's ironic that the new IHC hospital is being built where the first

hospital was destroyed. Where there were property owners, now there's just an apartment complex and unused property, creation of blight by the city. The redevelopment area is building a soccer stadium using tax dollars; dollars that should be going to pay for government services and educate the children of the community. Not to pay for a stadium so that some overgrown kids can play soccer. How much more of Murray City will disappear? Murray and Salt Lake are battling over a where a stadium should go, when there is a war going on in Iraq, a tsunami that has killed thousands of people, a flood in southern Utah that destroyed property. I wonder if Murray and Salt Lake have their priorities mixed up. Can't their time and money be put to better purposes? So when I drive to work tonight, where I work at Hill Air Force Base, I have to wonder what will Murray do. And I worry not about the traffic, flood, tsunamis, or war in Iraq, or even Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein, I worry about you, Murray City, and what you're going to do to my property, my home and my taxes. To either create more blight or to use it for something besides benefiting the citizens of this city. So whether or not blight exists, some of it was created by the city.

Pat Griffiths
I have a written statement from Wilma Smith and we'll just enter that in the record. I think some of these items we have in the record from the last meeting. So we'll just add this to the record. Thank you Mrs. Smith.

I have a comment form from Lee Brinton. Mr. Brinton, do your comments pertain to the existence or non-existence of blight? Ok, we'll address your comments later.

Is there anyone else who wished to testify regarding the existence or non-existence of blight. Seeing none I'll move on to the next section.

3. Public input into agency deliberations on the proposed Fireclay Redevelopment Project Area Plan

Pat Griffiths, Chair:

The Chair now invites property owners or their representatives, or members of the general public, to present any new or additional information which is not already part of the record to the Board of the Redevelopment Agency on their plans for future use and development of their property and any other new or additional information that they would like the Board of the Redevelopment Agency to consider in their deliberations on a plan for the proposed redevelopment project area.

We received today a statement regarding Murray stadium site from Mr. Paul Roberts, Brigham City, Utah, which will be entered into the record.

I'd like to now recognize Mr. Don Mullin of JWDM Development. Mr. Mullin is representing more than his individual self, so we'll allow you five minutes, is that sufficient for your presentation. Is there anyone while they're working out the technical problems?

Don Mullin 1196 East 1220 North Orem, Utah
I represent JWDM Development LC and Morinda Properties Inc. and we currently have approximately 43 acres of the proposed redevelopment project area under contract and in various stages of negotiations with different property owners in the RDA area as well as some properties that are adjacent to, but outside of the RDA area.

Pat Griffiths
While we're waiting we could have Mr. Brinton present his information, would you like to come forward? We're going to put Mr. Mullin on hold for a minute and have Mr. Brinton make his presentation.

Lee Brinton 4765 Meadowview Rd., Murray, Utah
My comments are basically threefold. First, I have a general question or a problem with the fundamental idea of public funds being used to subsidize sports arenas of any type. We see a lot of different projects throughout the country with varying degrees of participation and the general impression that I get from those is that they are subsidies for private organizations and private institutions that ought to be running their own programs. If they don't make sense without public funding, then they probably ought not to be done with public funding. The second concern that I have is that to this point we haven't any hard numbers regarding the tax implications of what's going on. The State Legislature is apparently this session going to talking about sales tax redistribution. If the RDA goes ahead and approves this, we'll be forfeiting property tax income for the foreseeable future with the hope that we'd be getting sales tax, but it's a big unknown right now as to whether those sales tax dollars would actually be coming to the city, or what percentage of them would be coming into the city. The city is talking about making a sizeable contribution, plus the ongoing overhead of maintaining, or providing services for this place without any assurance that we're going to get commensurate sales tax. So there's a big question mark on whether this thing even makes sense financially for the city to be involved. The final comment that I have goes back to a Chamber of Commerce meeting that we had here this last week, when Dave Checketts about the propriety of using public dollars to subsidize his project, he suggested that instead of looking at it as a subsidy that we ought to think of it as a partnership. As I think about it as a partnership, partnership includes investors who then have ownership of that project. What is sounds like is that we would be giving x number of dollars from the city and a good number of dollars from the county, but yet we're partners but we don't have any ownership in the project afterwards. It still seems like its an awfully nice subsidy for a private organization of people that if it makes sense to do it they ought to be doing it on their own nickel and not on tax dollars.

Don Mullin
This is to make the RDA board and the citizens aware of what our proposal would be to consider for the RDA plan. In the RDA area that's involved here, we currently have under contract properties which are vacant and others. We focused our development from guidelines presented in the study of transit oriented development by Envision Utah. It was a joint governmental private enterprise and an attempt to better utilize our space in

the State of Utah. One of the areas that particularly paid attention to was the 4500 South trax station. In order to take advantage of mass transit we've got to have residential here and have commercial in these other areas here. We've developed a residential component comprised of a 32 plex, a 40 plex, condominium units and townhome units that have been designed in here along with some limited "for rent" product. The rest is "for sale" product. This map shows the overall plan. It has the plan with the residential. This plan does show the soccer stadium. There was a question about environmental issues. There have been extensive environmental studies done in this area. One of the very best uses from an environmental standpoint is to have a soccer stadium right there. That is a very good use, or some other single user which would have a single, or a couple buildings with lots of parking. We have an office building here and retail between Main Street and State Street. This is an elevation of the plans we have to go in this project. These condominiums are 3 bedroom, 2 bath condominiums, and 2 bedroom 1 bath condominiums. The 3 bedroom, 2 bath units are valued about $120,000. The average sales price of condominiums currently on the market of 1500 sf or less in the City of Murray, the average sale price is between $94,000 and $100,000. This product, for the mean income family in Murray who makes $32,500 annually for a single person, that would put them just in the price range where they could afford to buy these condominiums. So for our teachers our firemen our policemen, this becomes a project where they could live. The townhomes in this project would range in price between $120,000 and $160,000. That gives an overview of our proposal for this area. We think that it's a financially feasible project, that it would be a great asset to Murray City. However we do understand that this may not fit Murray City's needs and what they would like to have, and we certainly understand that. But if this is what they would like to have, we are certainly prepared and would like to propose this plan and see it through to implementation.

Pat
Thank you Mr. Mullin. I'd now like to recognize Dean Howes with Real Salt Lake.

Dean Howes
Thank you Madam Chair, thank you Mayor, City Council and the RDA. We're honored and thankful that we can come here tonight to Murray and to spend just a couple minutes talking to you about the proposed used of this proposed redevelopment project area. We are in the middle of a very very difficult decision, not like any other in the business world, and that's where we locate this stadium, the home for Real soccer here in the Salt Lake Valley. We are thankful for Murray and their interest in this. Tonight what we'd like to do, and we've already done, is to listen to those that have already spoken and will speak so that we can get a good idea of what the community would like. We'd also, if we could, like to tell just a little bit about what we're doing so you have a better understanding of what it is and what it can bring to the community. Then we will be more than happy to answer any questions that the Council may have, if they have any, and if you don't we are more than happy to sit down.

May I just quickly make some introductions? I have several people here from Real Soccer, Dan Checketts who is the Vice Chairman, Scot Woodbury who is our game day

operations and the guy that will bring the excitement to the stadium. Right behind them, I've got Gary Rhimer who is our chief financial officer; and I did note several people talking about the financial returns on a project like this. We are certainly willing to discuss that with anybody that would to have to those discussions as we move forward. Next, Tom Love, from Love Communications who is our agency on this project, and Trey Fitzgerald who is our senior director of marketing and public relations. The stadium we're talking about seats 22,000 people. it's a multi purpose stadium. What we want to have is a stadium that is not only good for about 20-22 major league soccer events, but also hold about the same number of concerts and as well as community events in the facility. This is not something that is sacred ground, that once its built and the team starts playing on it that no one else is allowed to walk on the field. We want to have our high school athletes playing both football and soccer on it. Last year, if you read after the high school 5A, 4A and 3A championships were played, there were a tremendous number of complaints about that, about the health and safety of the youth, and that they were playing on inferior fields. We would like this to be the home of the high school athletes for both football and soccer and we have had the appropriate discussion with the Utah High School Athletic Association on that. It is designed to create an electrifying soccer experience. One of the things we want is a stadium that has good sight lines. Soccer is exciting and the "Number 1" sport in the world. It is also the "Number 1" youth sport here in Utah. There are more youth playing soccer per capita here than any community in the country. What this is, to be nice to comments that were made earlier, are not overgrown kids playing, but professionals that are playing, that are bringing an economic dymanic back to the community and back to this stadium. It gives our kids that are playing this a place to go, and a place to aspire to. Basketball, football, other key sports in this country have homes, where they can go play. Let me cover just a couple of other things. Real Salt Lake (the Dave Checketts group) will make an investment of about $60-65 million into this project. We have already made a considerable investment in this. When Dave uses the word partnership, it is in every sense a partnership. We have already invested a tremendous amount of money into this community without threats that we are going to take it to another community, but that we are here to bring Major League Soccer to this valley. We want this to be known as something that is more than bricks and mortar. We want it to be a transit oriented project. In other words, one of the reasons that we are so excited about the Murray project is because of the Trax stop that is right there. We see people from Utah County coming, from Davis County and from Salt Lake City coming down. We like the fact that as Mr. Mullen has just shown you, that there is parking around here that would be convenient and make the experience for those people that are participating, even better. We think that this is a family experience. Our ticket prices are not that of the Jazz or of NFL or of other major league sports. Our ticket prices will average in the $13-15 dollar range, very affordable for families. We will create 175 new jobs and we will create $95 million dollars per year in media exposure for this valley and $29 million in tax revenue for the state and local government in the first 10 years. We look at this and we hope it is, even here tonight, something that is a great unifier that brings together old and young, Democrat and Republican, Hispanic and non-Hispanic. We want this to be a place that we all come to and have an enjoyable experience. My final statement is that if have seen these young men as they have been introduced through the media, these are unique kids. These are Ivy League educated

kids, these are good kids, these are kids that represent this community very well, and our kids can aspire to become major league soccer players. What we want by having this in this community is to have our kids from this community playing on the team. Thank you.

Pat
Thank you Mr. Howes.

Judy Tukuafu
I used to work in Murray, I live about 2 blocks outside of Murray. I know that there's been a lot of pressures and incentives for the soccer stadium to go in Salt Lake City, but I feel like it would be great in Murray. In Salt Lake City there is a lot of pressure from hotels, restaurants and everything. To me it seems kind of desperate. For Murray, it's a central location in the valley and I personally don't take TRAX very often. I like to drive, and this area would be a lot easier to get to than going downtown. I think a lot of people coming from the north or the south would prefer to be able to get off at 53rd or 45th or ride TRAX than go downtown. A lot of the population is toward the south. Families with kids and a lot of soccer interest I think are more towards the south end than towards the central city. As far as Murray's central location also with West Valley City which has a lot of diversity and a lot of the roads lead straight east to west, you can get here easily. With Fashion Place Mall and all of this area, there are a lot of places to shop, a lot of variety. I think most people prefer to be in this part of the valley than to travel downtown to do those things. Downtown also already has a lot of venues such as the Delta Center, Capitol Theatre, etc., for entertainment and sports. I think it would be nice to have something without having to go downtown. West Valley City and Sandy, those venues are thriving and they're further south than downtown. Finally, I think Murray has a safe reputation, its known as a friendly place to be and I think it would be a great place to have this kind of program and neighborhoods and new businesses.

Pat Griffiths
I also have a letter from Robert J. and Doris Fisher dated January 6, which I'll put into the record. Mr. Fisher, is this new information for us.

Bob Fisher
I'm Bob Fisher of Utah Property Rights Association. Soccer is a fascinating name, I worked in Brazil and over there it's called football. They don't have the activity over there that we have in the summertime. I think they will find out that to get 20 or 25,000 people there is a big dream, and I was happy to see that Larry Miller finally fired a shot over the bow of this soccer thing. He just bought the baseball league, what he's doing and saying is I'm letting people know, everybody's just not going to move in here, I'm gonna protect my territory, I've got a big investment in this valley and I applaud him for that. The thing is 1 in 37 households filed for bankruptcy in Utah. That's double the national average. The Superintendent of Salt Lake School District believes that the State should require RDA to be funded differently instead of on the backs of the kids. I do have that article if you want to see it. The key is over there in Brazil they win a soccer game, nobody goes to work for 2 days. You might see a Volkswagen going down the road there's 25 people on it, there are more people killed after a soccer or football game

down there than you'll ever imagine. That's on the dutras, which are their highways and I know because I was there and I witnessed it. And so what bothers me a lot is the RDA money, their buying and selling property. Murray City's been buying and selling property. Then they're in the mortgage business and they mortgage things for different people, and its sad. We're a trusting population but the mortgage fraud is nearing an epidemic level. It's sad. I'm a believer in sports. Murray's got a great big soccer field right up here in Murray Park right where the rodeo grounds used to be. They have the indoor soccer. They've got all kinds of soccer. I think they're playing games between the fight with Murray and "Hollywood" Anderson. The reason I say "Hollywood" is because it's always showtime for him. What the key is I'm not against having sports and that for the kids. The lady that's sitting behind me is legally blind, deaf and you've got other people in wheelchairs around my place over on Edison Avenue. And its sad, all in the name of football.

Pat Griffiths
I'd now like to recognize Blain Benard representing Advanced Foam Plastics.
I think I can do this in about 30 seconds. I just want to remind that on November 9 we presented a detailed packet of information about Advanced Foam Plastics and about the desire of the company who has spent millions of dollars on this property to stay involved in the redevelopment plan. We think it's a key location. It's a little bit difficult with all due respect to Mr. Mullin, who we'd be happy to talk with. Our property sits between two sets of railroad tracks and it may be a little difficult to sell too many condominiums between two sets of railroad tracks. We're willing to participate and we want to be involved in the process and I just wanted to remind you that you have that packet of information which was part of the record on November 9.

Don Patton
My name is Don Patton and I'm a Murray resident. I don't think we're here tonight to discuss the soccer stadium. I think the real thing is the redevelopment of that area, and I think that should go whether the soccer stadium comes or goes. It could be an asset, but I don't think its essential to whether or not we redevelop the area. The area should be redeveloped. We have a large tract of land the largest tract of land within Murray City. It does have need and I recognize those that are there and we should work with those people who are there and have made the investment. We should treat everybody fair. But change has to take place, this area has to be developed. Its a large tract, but I think it ought to be extended up across the creek to 3900 South. That whole segment from 3900 to 4500 ought to be looked at as a big package. So we must move on, we must change that particular area, whether its blighted or not is a question. The definition of blight today is so bogged down that almost anything could be blighted if they want it to be. I think that wasn't the intent of the blight definition when it was originated by the legislature. So my position is I think the area needs to be redeveloped, I think the people that are within the area ought to be treated fairly and we ought to incorporate what we can of the existing businesses and commercial and so forth. The soccer stadium is for another day, Mr. Checketts will have to make that decision for us. Whether that will be here or Salt Lake, we accept it. Whether it's a good thing or not, that's his investment

and he'll have to take that chance, but the soccer stadium to me doesn't determine whether or not we develop the area.

Orden Yost
I'm Orden Yost, I live at 4616 South Atwood Blvd. and I appreciate the opportunity to speak. Thank you. I've been at some meetings with some of the people in this council in regard to transit oriented development, which is what we're looking at developing here in Murray. We have a great opportunity. One of the things about transit oriented development is that it is very expensive to do. Without involvement of cities or municipalities in helping this to take place, it doesn't happen. One of my very good friends spoke earlier, Mr. Lee Brinton. We live in the neighborhood and we have different opinions. He spoke about the taxes. We are getting very few if any taxes from that area today. If you bring in multiple businesses that create tax base, that give us income that will reduce our taxes or keep our taxes from going up every year, that's a benefit to all of us. Just reading from information given to me from the web, I just read today that $5 million were dropped into the economy at St. George this last week because of a soccer tournament. I'm not promoting the soccer, I'm just saying that $5 million went to St. George in 2 days. What does that do to all of our businesses, to all of us, if we can get that kind of tax dollar and that kind of activity in our location? Increased property taxes increase all of these opportunities to get more business and to be able to then develop other things in Murray that need to be done. This is just the tip of the iceberg. We have three locations of this nature in the City. We have a huge hospital that is going to come in. That hospital, the main building is a football field long and wide. It has five feet of cement at the bottom of it, it's huge. The amount of people that are going to come into Murray City, the needs that we have for housing and retail are great. At 5300, the Mimi's and the restaurants down there are already full, and we don't have the 4,000-6,000 employees and then all the people that are going to come to the IHC hospital. We have to find places in Murray to build residential, we need to find places in Murray to have housing, we need to have places in Murray to sit down and eat. Part of that can happen with a nice soccer stadium or something of that nature that would be there, that would be a catalyst to make all those things happen. 1,000 homes or 1,400 homes in that area isn't enough to support retail. You've got to have something else there that attracts people so that there can be a walking, transit oriented society there.

Anthony Willardson
I live at 834 Lucky Clover Circle in Murray. I just wanted to speak very briefly because I've been involved in the soccer community for several years. I've coached and refereed hundreds and thousands of kids over the last 16 years and if this area is declared blighted and a redevelopment agency proposal is put forward, I think this will be a wonderful opportunity. I can tell you that personally as a parent I have spent thousands of dollars every year taking my kids to soccer tournaments. I've already been to California once, I'll be going to Las Vegas and California another time. Sometimes I wonder why I spend all that money. I can tell you that my children themselves, my daughter played for Brigham Young University, she had offers or inquiries of playing professionally when they had a professional team. All of the opportunities though were on one coast or the other and nothing in between. I also have a son in law that played for Brigham Young on

their club team. If this facility is built here I can promise you that there will thousands of visitors coming in from all over the Intermountain area, because it's a lot closer to get to Salt Lake if you're in Wyoming or Nevada or even some of these areas, to see a professional soccer team play. I think there will be tremendous benefits economically to the community if that takes place; as well as to the development of soccer and to the youth programs in this area.

Richard Stauffer
When we talk about 99 or 98 acres we're talking about a lot of land. My concern is how fast can that be absorbed by housing. I did some numbers and its going to take 6-7 years to absorb that much in housing, if the whole thing should go into housing. With current absorption rates in Salt Lake County, they build about 5,000 housing units per year. This would take a period of 7 years. I think most developers go bankrupt after about the third or fourth year. The other thing is, if we're going to be a Redevelopment Agency, most of Murray was built after WWII. The City of Murray has the smallest homes on average of any city in Salt Lake County in square footage. We also have the smallest lots. So we have a lot of housing, most of it is inhabited by people about my age, who within the next ten years, not many of us are going to be left. So I would like to see high quality housing go into this area. I just not excited about something that costs $90,000. There's going to be plenty of homes. Murray is always rated highly when they've had affordable housing studies done, because of these older homes that were built back in the 1950's. The soccer stadium would significantly reduce the amount of land that has to absorbed in that development. So I think from that standpoint as well as attracting people there that it would be a benefit to the City of Murray. The taxes of people that would visit, spend money, go to dinner here, or to other types of activities would be beneficial and would increase the tax revenue to the City of Murray. If Mr. Checketts was here asking for $30 million I'd say absolutely not. That decision is not in our hands, its going to be made on a county basis.

Gaylon Jorgensen
I own property in Murray at 4926 South Box Elder Street. It is the Salt Lake Indoor Soccer Center. We bought that building about 14 years ago. It's an old building that they used to make pre-fab homes in. We've been playing indoor soccer there for 14 years. The company owned one other facility. We now own 17 facilities throughout the southwest, four of them here in Utah. All of these facilities were built by us, no public monies at all. Soccer is a very viable sport and can survive without a lot of public money. I'd love to see a stadium come here in Murray, that would be great. They could compete against me. But I'd love to buy some land real close by and to build a $2 million facility. I see a lot of people here that I recognize from soccer and that is the oldest building we have. It's time for Murray to have a brand new facility and I'd love to build a nice one here. Again, I'm asking the City of Murray to expend nothing. We don't need tax payer money. But if the stadium were here, I'd build a nice big brand new facility if I could and help these kids keep playing here. It is an opportunity to have a professional team here. There's a lot of support here. We hear it constantly. And if it were in Murray that would be great. Everyone wants to come to the facility that we own in Murray because it's the center of the valley. There are others popping up, but they

struggle. People like Murray. Murray is a good location to come to if you're coming from Provo, if you come from Ogden or if you come from the west or the east. It would be a good place.

Paul Dutson
I live on 65 East Edison Street. Last time when we had a meeting, the consultant didn't show pictures of our house because he said that he just went through and picked out some. So I brought some, so people could see how much time and money I spent on my place to improve it. There might be homes around my place that aren't beautiful but I've improved mine. I thought through my 8 or nine years since I've lived there, everybody else has improved their homes and upgraded. I live by someone who lives in a wheelchair. She just wants to know where she would move, and who will take care of her and her family. Just little things like we're leaving out where people are going to go or move. That's all I have to say.

Pat Griffiths
Those elements will be covered in a later part of the process. Maybe we could have Mr. Burnett explain that at the conclusion of the public hearing. Thank you Mr. Dutson, would you like those entered as part of the record? Thank you very much.

Is there anyone else who wishes to offer new and additional information?

My name is Jim Prindiville and I live at 97 West Woodrow. I hadn't planned on making any comments tonight. I just came to watch the RDA do its thing for future reference. But myself and most of my neighbors were under the opinion that tonight is basically designed to talk about blight or not blight in a given area. Yet, the fact that there is such a large contingent from the soccer people it makes me wonder if maybe the city isn't way down the tracks and the citizens haven't been able to catch up yet. In other words, if this were about the soccer stadium tonight, there'd be a lot more people here. But they just thought you were going to be talking blight or no blight, not what you do with it after the fact.

Pat Griffiths
That is the purpose of this meeting, is to determine the existence or non-existence of blight, and to receive additional input from the public to use in our deliberations. Is there anyone else who wished to comment? We'll now move on to the next portion of the public hearing. I would like to now invite any property owners or their representatives, or members of the general public, to present any comments to the Board of the Agency regarding the proposal to amend the boundaries of the 1977 Central Business District Redevelopment Project Area Plan to exclude certain properties included in the boundaries of the Fireclay Survey Area (specifically all properties located north of 4500 South and west of State Street) or the proposal to amend the boundaries of the Fireclay Survey Area to exclude certain properties not within Murray City boundaries (specifically parcels located at 4242, 4244 and 4250 South State Street).

I now invite public comment. Is there anyone who wished to comment on the information that I just presented. Seeing no one coming forth to comment, I will close the public hearing and we'll proceed with the balance of the agenda.

4. Consider a resolution adopting the findings of blight for the Fireclay Redevelopment Project area and directing that the Fireclay Redevelopment Project Plan should be pursued.

Frank Nakamura
In conversation with legal counsel, Jody Burnett, and Karen Wikstrom, there are some minor changes. Reference to the redevelopment project area should be the redevelopment survey area and I presented that to you. Also you are making a determination that a redevelopment project area is feasible with the Fireclay Survey Area. Those are very technical changes, so I have presented that to you.

Pat Griffiths
Is there any discussion among Board members?

Jeff Dredge
When I look back to the minutes of our last meeting, Krista asked on a scale from 1-10 whether this survey area constituted blight. Mr. Chong answered it was a 7.5 on a scale of 1-10. That's fairly conclusive to me that this area falls within that classification.

Jeff Dredge moved to adopt the resolution of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City adopting the findings of blight for the Fireclay Redevelopment Survey Area and directing that a Redevelopment Project Area Plan should be prepared for the Fireclay Survey Area.

Seconded by Jim Brass.

5 Ayes
0 Nayes

Pat Griffiths
I'm wondering if one of our consultants or Mr. Burnett would like to explain to the property owners about the finding of blight, especially if it pertains to individual homes.

Alice Larkin Steiner
A finding of blight pertains to the entire survey area. It is not a property specific finding and through this finding of blight and the additional step that they are recommending that a plan be prepared, the next step is to go ahead and prepare the plan.

Pat Griffiths
Thank you. I did that so that the individual property owners would clearly understand the action that we've taken tonight.

5. Consider a Resolution of the Redevelopment Agency to amend the 1977 Central Business District Redevelopment Plan as amended in 1982 and 1999 to delete a portion of the project area.

Moved by Krista Dunn
Seconded by Robbie Robertson

5 Ayes
0 Nayes

6. Election of chair and vice chair of the board of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City.

Robbie Robertson nominated Jim Brass as chair

Seconded by Jeff Dredge

5 Ayes
0 Nayes

Jim Brass nominated Pat Griffiths as vice-chair

Seconded by Krista Dunn

5 Ayes
0 Nayes

7. Consider the adoption of a calendar of meetings for 2005.

Jim Brass moved that the board adopt the meeting schedule as printed.

Seconded by Robbie Robertson

5 Ayes
0 Nayes

8. Overview of continuing RDA process

Alice Steiner
The next step is for the RDA to put together a project area plan. It is my understanding that the RDA has hired a planning consultant whom you met earlier, Karen Wikstrom and Jan Streifel. They will be working together to come up with an overall plan about what will happen in the project area. It is also my understanding that plan will come through in two ways. The first one is it will probably be part of city's master plan as well as also being an RDA plan. We don't yet know what all that the plan will include. It will probably attempt to take advantage of the 4300 South transit station in some way and

probably propose uses near the transit station that are appropriate for being near a transit station. Other than that, I think there's a fair amount of room for discussion. After a plan is drafted with the Planning Commission as Karen indicated, it will then come before this Board again. There will be another public hearing. You will all be notified of that public hearing and before that public hearing you can come in and get a copy of the plan, review it and then at the public hearing make any comments you want to make about what is in the real plan. Assuming that a plan gets adopted, which it may or may not, the RDA would also be proceeding to put together a tax increment investment budget. It would be trying to figure for the tax increment generated, which is the increase in property taxes within the project area, how those monies should be invested to cause improvements in the project area to occur. Once that budget is put together it has to go through two review processes, one is with this Board and the other is with a board made up of representatives of the various taxing entities who levy property taxes in the area, since the taxes will come from the increase in property taxes in the area. If that budget is adopted by both of those parties, then development can proceed. Without knowing the plan, none of us know exactly what that means, but hopefully it will be wonderful.
It is required by State law that if the RDA uses eminent domain that they pay a fair value for the property and that they pay a total of just compensation, which means compensation to move people to whatever would be an appropriate accommodation for them, which is of equal quality and stature as what they had previously. It does have to have good access if you currently have good access. Additionally for everyone, the RDA is usually in a position to help people who are interested in moving out, whether or not eminent domain is used, to find alternative properties. In terms of eminent domain, this Board has not made any decisions about it. But if they do choose to use eminent domain the State Legislature has made it very clear that is does have to be in a very fair process. Everyone has to get substitute property that is as good as what they had before. Or, they have to get money that is equal in value to the property. This is not a losing proposition for anyone.

9. Approval of Minutes

The board agreed to defer approval of minutes until minutes from both parts of the hearing could be considered together.

The meeting was adjourned.