



Electronic Meeting Only

Public Notice is hereby given that this meeting will occur electronically without an anchor location in accordance with Utah Code 52-4-207(4), due to infectious disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus. The RDA Board Chair has determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location because physical distancing measures may be difficult to maintain in the Murray City Council Chambers. (See attached RDA Board determination.)

Any member of public may view the meeting via the live stream at www.murraycitylive.com or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>.

To make public comments during the meeting please register at <https://tinyurl.com/5ay3apvz> OR submit comments via email at: rda@murray.utah.gov.* *Comments are limited to 3 minutes or less, and written comments will be read into the meeting record. Please include your name and contact information.*

AGENDA

3:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 16, 2021

- 1. Approval of January 19, 2021 RDA meeting minutes**
- 2. Citizen comments (see above for instructions)***
- 3. Closed Session per Utah State Code 52-4-205-1e to discuss the purchase, exchange or lease of real property**
(Presenter: Melinda Greenwood)
- 4. Consideration of motion to approve strategy discussed in closed session regarding the purchase, exchange or lease of real property**
- 5. Project updates**
(Presenter: Melinda Greenwood)

Special accommodations for the hearing or visually impaired will be upon a request to the office of the Murray City Recorder (801-264-2660). We would appreciate notification two working days prior to the meeting. TTY is Relay Utah at #711.

On March 9, 2021, a copy of the foregoing Notice of Meeting was posted in accordance with Section 52-4-202 (3).

Melinda Greenwood

Melinda Greenwood
RDA Deputy Executive Director

The Redevelopment Agency (RDA) of Murray City met on Tuesday, January 19, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. for a meeting held electronically in accordance with Utah Code 52-4-207(4), due to infectious disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus. The RDA Board Chair has determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location because physical distancing measures may be difficult to maintain in the Murray City Council Chambers.

Any member of public may view the meeting via the live stream at www.murraycitylive.com or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>. *If you would like to make public comments during the meeting please register at: <https://tinyurl.com/y2zpucq7> OR you may submit comments via email at: rda@murray.utah.gov. Comments are limited to 3 minutes or less, and written comments will be read into the meeting record.

RDA Board Members

Dale Cox, Chair
Brett Hales, Vice Chair
Director Kat Martinez
Rosalba Dominguez
Diane Turner

Others in Attendance

Blair Camp, RDA Executive Director
Melinda Greenwood, RDA Deputy Executive Director
Janet Lopez, City Council Executive Director
Jennifer Kennedy, City Recorder
Jennifer Heaps, Chief Communications Officer
G.L. Critchfield, City Attorney
Brenda Moore, Finance & Admin. Director
Jared Hall, Planning Division Supervisor
Jay Baughman, Economic Development Specialist
Citizens

Mr. Cox called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Agenda Items 1 and 2: Approval of the December 8, 2020 and January 5, 2021 RDA meeting minutes

MOTION: Ms. Turner moved to approve the minutes from December 8, 2020 and January 5, 2021 RDA meetings. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Martinez.

Ms. Martinez	Aye
Mr. Cox	Aye
Ms. Dominguez	Aye
Ms. Turner	Aye
Mr. Hales	Aye

Motion Passed 5-0

Agenda Item 3: Citizen Comments

Kate Sturgeon – Murray City, Utah (comments submitted via email)

Dear Mayor Camp, City Council, Redevelopment Agency, Mr. Hall, Ms. Lopez, Ms Greenwood (and others mentioned within, but I was unable to find an email address for whomever makes traffic decisions for the city)

This is a long list, with multiple areas of concern, but these are the things on my neighbors' and my minds regarding the city's move forward with recent planning options/decisions.

My true angst is seeing what former Murray mayor Dan Snarr's vision for Murray (becoming "just like every other city between Salt Lake and Provo") coming to fruition. Our taxes, utility rates, crime rates are all rising. Services are not keeping pace with increased demand, and now "Mixed Use" zoning is being considered in places where it shouldn't. Jared Hall of the Zoning Dept got down to basics for mixed-use: money or as he said, "better reward with mixed-use than with individual homes or small businesses." The charm of what used to be Murray is rapidly disappearing with new, replacement projects.

Murray has the advantage of being in the heart of the valley, with some of the last large parcels of (re)developable land. No one is making any MORE land. As the real estate axiom goes, it's location, location, location. Gone (or should be gone) are the days of Murray's inferiority complex of accepting any old proposal from the first taker. When I moved here in 1990, a mayoral candidate was dancing/ecstatic that "the last parcel in Murray's been sold." Because back then, Murray wasn't the place to be and you couldn't give it away. Fast forward 30 years, and you, as city leaders, managers and the ones who shape the future of our city, have the unique opportunity to make this redevelopment into something to be proud of, and not just another identical, cookie cutter suburb with uninspired/cloned architecture.

Where is a welcoming entrance to Murray? Certainly not State Street. Not Vine Street (which after the recent redo from 900 E > 1300 E is just a heat absorbing/then reflecting, treeless multilane mess). Heading in from the industrialized west, not there either. 900 E isn't particularly pretty, until one reaches 5900 S > Winchester, the very area mixed-use is being considered, where new businesses and Wheeler Farm are. Winchester itself is a five lane speedway, with its own set of issues.

Trees are the cheapest and easiest way to improve aesthetics as well as help cool a city. It seems the design trend of late is to butt projects up to the sidewalk, therefore increasing heat absorbing surfaces with no return benefit (ie., harnessing all that solar power for positive return), and thus negating any possibility for a shady spot. Examples: the corner of Vine and State, with the hotels (mixed-use zoning); the new project at Winchester/520 E.; the proposed new mixed use building being considered for 4800 S & State Street (at least according to the illustrations provided in the project proposal). Residents exiting the subdivision behind the new construction at 520 E/Winchester have obscured vision of oncoming traffic, as a result of 7' walls abutting the sidewalk. Whoever approved the sight lines needs to review reality and not wishful thinking. It may meet established guidelines, but no one goes the speed limit (or under) on Winchester. Murray Police Department could make bank issuing speeding citations there. I ask for better coordination between the planning department and traffic study group, to go onsite to witness reality and not go by what a book says should work. And, in searching Murray's website for emails, I was surprised to learn Murray has a "Shade Tree and Beautification Commission. Why are they not involved in planning decisions? They seem rather neutered at present.

One would think the tree lesson was learned when Fashion Place Mall took out all its mature trees to xeriscape (?). Previously, the walk around there was almost pleasant, but no longer. One must use their car to access the shopping center across the street, or move anywhere in that area. Local residents are

also ripping out their mature trees. I think we will learn a sad lesson as the summers heat up more and more, and there is less and less respite from the relentless sun.

Walkability in Murray overall has suffered as well, but specifically, (pre-covid) children in the James Point Apts cross Winchester (a five lane freeway) to get to their elementary school. Not all children head to the 725 E stoplight. Just as cars don't always adhere to speed limits, children don't always take the 'approved' route. The UDOT's blinking light straddling 900 E. at Wheeler Farm is just as dangerous, because the pedestrian can't see when the lights are flashing, thereby safe to cross. A simple walk light coordinated with the flashing lights would mitigate that. Longview Elementary children use that space to cross 900 E. for their Wheeler Farm field trips.

Putting mixed-use zoning at the corner of 900 E & Winchester doesn't make sense. It doesn't fit with the current aesthetic of Murray and the established residential neighborhood surrounding this plat. The corner of 900 E and Winchester is not Ft Union, yet. Please don't turn it into that. Logic would say that it makes far more sense to continue in the vein of the offices which line 900 E from 5900 S to Winchester, on the west side. They're attractive and should be producing tax revenue for the city. It also keeps in line the quasi residential look that "up to 360 units" mixed-use zoning can't. Correct the error which was made 50+ years ago, when RC Willey was permitted to locate its building there. One error needn't be replaced by another.

Mixed-use makes far more sense in the sea of asphalt between 5900 S – 6100 S and State Street, which is the Shopko pad, the old Toys R Us pad, or Van Winkle & 5600 S. It makes far more sense to happen in those locales, where restaurants & ground floor businesses would be welcome; green space could replace heat-absorbing asphalt. Murray has lots of those kinds of eyesores which would make far more sense to change zoning to mixed-use, than sticking one in an established residential area.

In looking at the plans for the 4800 S/State Street development, and reading the proposal submitted by the architectural firm, it states that the "minimum parking requirements have been met." So, before the cement has cured, there will already be overflow parking issues. This project uses today's standards, and since this building will have a shelf life of 30-50 years, parking will be grossly inadequate for decades to come. We are currently dealing with the effects of poor parking planning with the lawyer bldg. at the corner of 725 E/Winchester. Cars from that complex spill out onto 725 E and are not contained within the business' lot. That building/complex is only a few years old, and we already have serious issues there. And that they threaten to sue the city when asked to do something indicates a serious error was made. Can we please learn from it?

Murray's website is chronically out of date: there's nothing of substance on Murray's website re the Fashion Place West Small Area Plan. If one wants to become educated on the happenings in Murray City's government, isn't its website the first stop for its citizens to educate themselves re projects being considered? Informing a wider area than only those within a 300' or 500' adjacent perimeter of actions under city consideration would be incredibly helpful as well. This current 300-500' notice limits Murray citizen engagement regarding the future of their city.

Thank you for letting me air some issues which have been building (no pun intended!) of late. Granted, covid hasn't helped. (When discussing some of the above with a neighbor, he asked "where are they meeting so I can go", not having a clue that meetings have been held online for months.) But also not

helping is Murray City making these decades-long-impacting decisions without the input of its citizens, simply because said citizens didn't know they were under consideration. Good communication is essential in every walk of life, and none more so than local government with its citizens.

Alex Teemsma – Murray City, Utah (spoken comments and comments submitted via email)

My name is Alexander Teemsma. I live at 10 W Miller Street, Murray, UT, District One. What up, Redevelopment Agency people! Hope you all are doing well and thank you for the work you are doing. I just want to share a few thoughts regarding the proposed Gerding Edlen development in the Murray City Center District (MCCD):

I tried to do a little research on Gerding Edlen. Their website is not working for me right now; however, I was able to look into their Brewery Blocks development in Portland. Apologies if I'm sharing information you already know.

Gerding Edlen did an absolutely awesome job with the First Regiment Armory Annex, which is now Portland Center Stage at The Armory. Wikipedia says "The Armory has become a significant case study for historic preservation and sustainable design." I have confidence that Gerding Edlen can do the same in Murray City, striking a balance between innovative, sustainable development while highlighting the beauty of nearby, historically significant properties.

That being said, the concern I would like to share is how the proposed development in the MCCD, aside from aesthetics, will affect the character of the downtown and Murray as a whole. As I understand it, Gerding Edlen will decide what businesses will occupy the retail and dining fronts.

The Brewery Blocks website shows that there are 27 retail/dining spaces shared between the 5 blocks (<http://www.breweryblocks.com/retailers/>). Of the 27 retail/dining spaces at The Brewery Blocks, 2 are unoccupied and 20 are national brands (e.g., The North Face, Lululemon, Starbucks, Sur La Table, etc.). The remaining 5, per my count, include: the theatre; Frame Central, a framing store with seven locations limited to the Pacific Northwest; two restaurants; and Rachelle M., a fashion specialty store with three locations throughout Oregon. So more than 80% of the retail fronts are leased to large businesses with no specific ties to Portland or even Oregon.

While the selection of stores may have been influenced by the fact that Portland is a larger city, larger than Murray City anyway, it would seem Gerding Edlen could do more to prioritize leasing to locally-owned restaurants and stores. Or maybe smaller businesses wouldn't be able to afford the leases. Regardless, the selection process of lessees for the future development in Downtown Murray is something that ought to be re-evaluated. The types of businesses that fill those spaces will have long-lasting implications for the character of Downtown Murray. I look at Downtown Provo as an inspiration for the things Murray could do, and of the 133 retail and dining options listed on their website, I could count on one hand the number of national brands (<https://www.downtownprovo.com/maps/>).

Murray has plenty of big box store and national brand/chain representation throughout the city and at Fashion Place Mall.

I am unsure of the legality of influencing the selection of lessees, but maybe a provision can be made in the MCCD guidelines or the deal with Gerding Edlen can be negotiated to include specific requirements for retail and dining space lessees (i.e., approval from the RDA).

Janice Strobell – Murray City, Utah (spoken comments)

Ms. Strobell said she supports the comments made by Alex in regard to local vs. national businesses in Murray. She commended the Board as they bring the city into the future and on their desire to listen to individuals in their decision making. She asked that the Board consider the following questions as they work on the 4800 South and State Street development:

- How is this project enhancing diversity and building on what makes Murray one of a kind?
- Does this project promote diversity in both population and business?
- How does this project support and encourage local “mom & pop” and startup businesses to come to downtown Murray?
- Does this project harmonize with the surrounding built environment that has been the mark of arriving in Murray?
- Will such a development enhance or detract from Murray’s charm?

She trusts that the Board will honor what has made Murray today and build upon that identity as we build a bright future.

Joseph Silverzweig – Board Member, Murray Area Chamber of Commerce (comments received via email)

Dear Board,

The Murray Area Chamber of Commerce is excited to see our local government’s continued investment into the economic development of Murray’s downtown. This part of our city has the potential to be a humming engine of commerce and the plans put forward by the contractor the board has selected look like a great balance of uses that will make it a destination for residents and businesses alike.

As the process moves from the conceptual to the practical phases, the Chamber is hopeful that the business community, along with local residents, will be an active participant in the development discussion. We are confident that our insight into Murray’s economy will help make the project as engaging and productive part of our community as possible.

Agenda Item 4: Workshop Presentation and Discussion – Melinda Greenwood presenting

Ms. Greenwood presented information regarding the history of the Central Business District redevelopment area. It was formed in 1979 for a 32-year period. It triggered in 1983 and was set to expire in 2014 but was renewed in 2010 for an additional 20 years. The new expiration year is 2034. The project area will have been in existence for 54 years by the time it finally expires.

The MCCD zone allowed unlimited height for buildings, but in 2018 it was changed to limit height to 135 feet. In early 2019, Ms. Greenwood sent out a survey asking the RDA Board about their opinion on the most important elements of the MCCD. The RDA subsequently held a workshop in the spring to allow for in depth discussions about the survey results and to obtain consensus on a direction to go to facilitate development. Based on the workshop discussion, the Community & Economic Development Department moved forward with an ordinance revision which was adopted by the City Council. The intent of the ordinance change was to simplify the development process and modify the historical preservation provisions. The Design Review Committee was retained as part of this ordinance revision.

In 2020, the RDA used the updated ordinance to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the development of the RDA's property at 48th and State Street. Prior to issuing the RFP, the RDA Board reviewed the draft document and submitted comments to which staff responded. The RFP was then opened on April 6, 2020 and closed on July 10, 2020. All communication with interested parties was conducted through the state's procurement website to ensure the integrity of the RFP and to ensure questions and answers were available to all interested parties. Ms. Greenwood sent the RFP to approximately 100 different developers and groups as well as the state of Utah procurement website.

Ms. Dominguez asked how many of those developers were out of state. Ms. Greenwood stated that that number was a mix of in-state and out of state developers. Most were local, however. The state's procurement website reached many developers, but she did know how many or their location. Ms. Greenwood emphasized that she made a concerted effort to contact developers who were local or who have done work in Utah in the past.

Ms. Greenwood explained the RDA received five proposals which were deemed responsive, meaning they successfully met the requirements of the RFP. With guidance from the city's legal counsel and procurement staff, a review committee was formed and scoring criteria was created to score the proposals. The committee reviewed the five proposals using scoring sheets and created a short-list for in-person interviews. Two firms were selected to be interviewed by the committee in September. The entire committee agreed upon the top firm to forward to the Board for their review. At the November 19, 2020 RDA meeting the Board voted 3-2 to enter exclusive discussions with the Edlen Company, LLC (Edlen). The proposal was submitted under the name of Gerding-Edlen, but the company's name changed following the proposal submission and our discussions with them.

Based on comments and questions raised at the November 19th RDA meeting Ms. Greenwood presented information on the MCCD zoning ordinance and what aspects it controls versus what aspects of the project will be controlled by market considerations. She explained that the MCCD governs density and the number of units per acre as well as maximum building height. Public improvements such as open space and sidewalks are regulated by the MCCD ordinance. Parking is regulated by the MCCD as is allowed uses, design factors (to a limited extent, such as building scale and materials), and the approval process.

Ms. Greenwood continued to explain that market and financial decisions or factors dictate density as well. The developer will make decisions on height or number of units per acre based on their financials. If what they desire is against the MCCD ordinance, staff informs them it is not allowed. A developer may then reconfigure their design or financials so the project can move ahead. If the developer proposes a project with height or density levels that conform to the ordinance, the project can move forward to get approvals. In November, the topic of owned versus rental units was a point of discussion for the RDA Board and ownership is something that is driven by the market. Ms. Greenwood recommended the Board not get involved in ownership unless they are prepared to compensate for impacts on how it would affect the developer's business model.

Commercial space tenancy is dictated by the uses of the zone which is spelled out in the MCCD. We can indicate what we would like, but the developer and market forces will have the ultimate say in what goes into commercial spaces. The design of the development is not something that we can dictate to the developer.

The MCCD zone dictates the approval process and that process is what the RDA and city anticipate following. Some of the Board Member's comments from the November meeting revolved around a public comment process. Although Edlen Company is willing to include a public comment process, apart from the Planning Commission meeting, this is not required by the ordinance. All projects in the MCCD go before the Design Review Committee and the Planning Commission. These meetings are publicly noticed and at the Planning Commission there is an opportunity for the public to comment.

Ms. Greenwood then transitioned the meeting to Mr. Hall to go over the rest of the project approval process outlined in the MCCD zone. He explained that every project goes through a pre-application conference where the developer talks through the project and gets direction and feedback for their formal application. When an application is received, city staff such as Engineering, Fire, Building, etc., give feedback and it is first sent to the Design Review Committee (DRC). The DRC will review the project and forward the project to the Planning Commission with a recommendation, though often the project may be referred back to the DRC with requested changes. The DRC is a recommending body and does not make project approvals. When the DRC recommends approval of a project, it gets scheduled with the Planning Commission for a public hearing where public comments are received before the Planning Commission makes a decision. There is a standard of review that has been adopted to ensure that the project conforms the ordinance and various plans such as General Plan.

Mr. Hall noted that the MCCD Guidelines "shall be consulted during the review of the proposed development in order to provide guidance, direction and options which will further the stated purposes of the MCCD. Wherever practicable, developments should adhere to the objectives and principles contained in the Design Guidelines." Ms. Turner asked for clarification of what "practicable" meant. Mr. Hall explained that it means that a project should not be thrown out because it does not meet every single "checkbox" or requirement in the 50 pages of the guidelines. Ms. Dominguez pointed out that the above statement that Mr. Hall read was not in the MCCD guidelines and asked if it was in a new version. Mr. Hall explained that the statement comes from the city code, title 17, which references the MCCD Zone. Ms. Greenwood explained some of the changes between the MCCD guidelines before and after the November 2019 revisions. Ms. Turner commented on how the term "practicable" could be interpreted loosely and that it could introduce changes. Staff explained further how the DRC has the ability to ensure that design elements are met while simultaneously being flexible.

Mr. Cox stated that we need to have opportunities for public comment on the RDA project, and the earlier the better, because it may affect the design of the project. Ms. Greenwood stated that Edlen Company is open to having public engagement opportunities and they have discussed having a process once the site plan has been reviewed and a more refined concept has been finalized.

Ms. Greenwood asked Mr. Hall to clarify design guidelines versus development standards. Murray City has elected to have the design standards in the City ordinance.

Ms. Greenwood then shifted the topic to parking and explained some of the issues which lead to parking issues in the Fireclay area. When a development agreement was approved about 12 years prior the parking structure was included in the third phase of the project which never occurred. The developer walked away from the project, leading to a situation where needed parking spaces were never provided and contributing to the current lack of parking in the area. The city has learned a lesson from this and would not propose a similar agreement to the RDA Board again and would require a parking structure to

be completed as a first phase.

Mr. Hall reviewed current parking requirements and reiterated the need to have parking structures built up front because of their expense. Further, developers are no longer allowed to count on-street parking as part of mandatory parking requirements. Executive Director Camp clarified that on-street parking was allowed by the code but changed to disallow it around 2015 or 2016. Ms. Dominguez asked how other cities handle parking issues. Mr. Hall said that development agreements are commonly used by other cities and that Murray City handles these projects in much the same way. Ms. Greenwood said that she has received some additional information regarding the Fireclay Area parking approvals and that she would send that information to the RDA Board.

Ms. Greenwood transitioned the discussion to the Edlen project at 48th and State Street. Edlen has provided a tentative timeline for the project with the approval process being completed in winter of 2021 and construction starting in the spring of 2022 and the development opening in the spring of 2024.

Mr. Cox stated that he is impressed with the developer and again encouraged public input on the project. Ms. Turner said that she wanted to involve the citizens in the project as soon as possible. She also was wondering if there was a way to work diversity into the types of living units in the project. Ms. Greenwood responded that typically conducts a market study to determine what types of units will rent the best. We can try to have a dialogue about our desires, but a developer will base a project on market forces. Ms. Turner expressed concerns about what she believes will be higher-income units in the project. Ms. Greenwood asked for clarity on what "diversity" meant and Ms. Turner stated she meant income levels as well as the makeup of owned vs. rental units, stating a preference to see a mix housing types rather than just having it all be expensive apartments that are going to end up requiring several people living in them to allow people to afford them. Ms. Greenwood said that she would express those concerns and preferences to the developer. Mr. Hales expressed his belief that Edlen would be on board with those ideas. Ms. Greenwood agreed that they would likely be sensitive to the concerns that are expressed but that they are also very experienced in projects such as this and may find that what the public prefers or desires is not always able to be included for various reasons. Ms. Turner expressed that the idea that decisions for the project are solely market driven grates on her because this project is where we are taking the city. Ms. Greenwood then answered an earlier question about the RFP distribution, stating that 259 vendors were notified of the project through the state's procurement website.

Ms. Martinez agreed that bringing the public in is desirable as the process can sometimes be confusing. She wondered when the project will be coming before the RDA Board for a decision or vote. Ms. Greenwood stated that one of the reasons that the committee chose Edlen over the other firm being considered is because Edlen did not ask for any public funds such as tax increment financing. If the RDA imposes its desires to have aspects of the project such as ownership and affordable housing, Edlen would likely ask for funding to make up the difference and the Board needs to be willing to subsidize their preference. There are several items for the RDA Board to consider and those may be brought forward individually throughout the year. If Edlen were to bring a project proposal to the RDA Board that they could all agree upon, meets code and guidelines, and requested no TIF funding, then the next step would be to draft an agreement to sell the property to them. If they do ask for TIF funding, then there would be a Participation and Development Agreement for the RDA Board to approve. The soonest that something like that would be before the Board would be June or July, but more likely later in the year than that.

Mr. Hales thanked Melinda for her explanation and asked if the Board chooses to provide TIF funds to the developer that it means that the citizens are paying for that subsidy. Ms. Greenwood agreed, but the nice thing about RDA project areas is that the money is not paid out unless they perform on the development agreement. She warned that the RDA can only capture project funds for the life of the project area which expires in 2034 and that the longer it sits, the less money any project can bring in, and this would impact that RDA's ability to provide an incentive.

Ms. Dominguez asked how the market factors for housing units are determined by the developer and at what point in time. Ms. Greenwood stated that Edlen would have done some research while developing their proposal. Ms. Dominguez asked if it were possible for the developer's market assumptions to be adjusted by changing economic forces. Ms. Greenwood agreed that the assumptions and proposals can change, and referenced a project that recently adjusted the density of their project because of changing market factors but confirmed that once a project is approved, it cannot be changed without going through the official channels for an amendment.

Ms. Dominguez then expressed a concern that citizens in her district are feeling like they are unheard. She asked what we are doing to follow up with citizens' comments and whose responsibility is it to do the follow up. Ms. Greenwood responded that staff are always available for board members and citizens to ask questions of and are happy to provide accurate information and explain how the development process works. A lot of times, public comments are not items that can be addressed by existing ordinances and regulations. As public officials, we need to help the public understand that when a project complies with our ordinance, land use laws do not allow a project to be denied because of negative public comments. Ms. Dominguez said there is a feeling of disconnect with citizens and wondered what goes into approving these projects in the terms of studies, such as traffic and environmental, as well as how they impact infrastructure and police and fire.

Ms. Greenwood responded that a traffic circulation study was done in the vicinity of the 48th and State Street project before the RFP for the project was issued so that developers would understand the current traffic in the project area. The City Engineer can require a traffic study for any project they feel is warranted and city code requires a traffic study when a development is at or above a certain density. Utilizing some brownfields grant funds, the city has done an environmental study for the project site as well. For public infrastructure, we know that some powerlines will need to be relocated. She added that staff is not aware of any water or sewer issues, but there will be some work to be done on the storm drainage. Impact fees are required by the city for sewer, power, storm water and water and are paid for by the developer. Police and fire are not covered by impact fees in Murray, so that would have to be addressed through input from the Police and Fire Chiefs and the budget process.

Agenda Item 5: Project Updates – Melinda Greenwood presenting

Ms. Greenwood stated that that cell phone tower relocation (at the new city hall site) is under way and that construction will take between 8 to 10 weeks, putting completion at the end of March.

The 4200 South road construction in Fireclay is complete and Public Works Department did a great job of keeping the budget down on that project. We have approved the apartment complex's new parking lot, which should alleviate parking issues.

We have received dates for the exclusive negotiation agreement with Edlen and will be moving forward

with that agreement and eventual distribution of the executed agreement to the Board.

The Jesse Knight Legacy Center is still working with Utah's Department of Environmental Quality on the site clean-up for their project.

We have completed a Phase 1 and 2 environmental study for the THINK Architecture property, which was paid for by a Brownfields Coalition grant. These grants are federal funds but tend to make projects take longer.

Salt Lake County has sent us our initial 2020 tax year disbursement for the Fireclay Area, so RDA staff will work with the Finance Department and Zion's Public finance to determine TIF disbursement amounts for the property owners in the area.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

DRAFT



TO: RDA Board
THROUGH: Mayor Blair Camp, RDA Executive Director
FROM: Melinda Greenwood, RDA Deputy Executive Director *MG*
MEETING DATE: March 16, 2021
RE: Agenda items #3 and 4: Closed session to discuss the purchase, exchange or lease of real property

Staff is requesting a closed session with the RDA Board to discuss the purchase, exchange or lease of real property. Utah State Code 52-4-205-1e allows for discussions such as this to take place without public in attendance in order to protect a potential real estate transaction.

To legally enter into a closed session, state law requires a roll call vote be taken on a motion which includes the purpose for the closed session. For the motion to pass, two thirds of the quorum present must vote to enter the closed session.

Once the steps are completed, those invited to attend the closed session will need to use a zoom link to enter a separate meeting which will not be broadcast to the public. When the closed session is concluded, the RDA Board will need to re-enter the zoom meeting link which is being live streamed to the public and make a motion to approve the strategy discussed during the closed session.

A suggested outline of the process is provided for your reference.

PROPOSED MOTION: I move that we go into closed session pursuant to Utah Code Sections 204 and 205 of Title 52, Chapter 2 of the Open and Public Meetings Act to:

hold a strategy session to discuss the purchase of real property because public discussion of the transaction would disclose the estimated value of the property and would prevent the Board from completing the transaction on the best possible terms.

Such a strategy session is allowed pursuant to Section 52-4-205(1)(d) of the Utah Code.

SECOND.

ROLL CALL VOTE.

CHAIR: PUBLICLY ANNOUNCE AND REQUEST TO HAVE ENTERED INTO THE MINUTES:

- 1) Reason(s) for the closed session:
to discuss the acquisition of real property

2) Location of closed session:

to be held electronically over Zoom for the reasons given in the Chair's statement from the beginning of the regular, public meeting, ie, to protect the health of meeting participants and the public

3) Vote by name of each Board member, either for or against the motion to hold the closed session:

Dominguez	For	(or Against)
Martinez	For	(or Against)
Cox	For	(or Against)
Turner	For	(or Against)
Hales	For	(or Against)

GO INTO CLOSED SESSION WITH SEPARATE ZOOM LINK.

- 1) Item presentation and discussion
- 2) Come to a consensus on the strategy for moving forward

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION USING INITIAL ZOOM MEETING LINK.

MOTION TO APPROVE STRAGEGY DECIDED UPON.

SECOND.

VOTE.

CHAIR TO ANNOUNCE DECISION: The Board for the RDA of Murray City just met in closed session to discuss the purchase of real property. We met in closed session to avoid disclosing the estimated value of property or other items related to a real estate transaction and to ensure that the RDA can complete the transaction on the best possible terms. After discussion, the Board approved having staff proceed with a strategy negotiate the best possible terms of the real estate transaction.

NEXT AGENDA ITEM.



TO: RDA Board
THROUGH: Mayor Blair Camp, RDA Executive Director
FROM: Melinda Greenwood, RDA Deputy Executive Director *MG*
MEETING DATE: March 9, 2021
RE: Agenda Item #5: March 2021 Project Updates

A brief update on RDA projects is provided below.

1. **Cell Phone Tower Relocation** – Verizon is now installing their equipment on the new tower. Unfortunately, American Tower Company and T-Mobile have yet to sign a lease agreement to authorize T-Mobile to move from the current tower to the new tower. Until these two parties execute a lease, the current tower must remain in service, which is causing construction delays to the new city hall. The City Attorney is working with outside legal counsel to determine if we can assist in moving this project forward.
2. **4800 South State Street Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (ENA)** – A geotechnical study will be conducted on the site in the coming weeks. This study is necessary to determine feasibility of different types of construction and is needed prior to design work continuing. Staff is finalizing a scope for a traffic study. The traffic study will be project specific, will need to comply with UDOT standards, and will build on the neighborhood circulation plan which was completed about a year ago.
3. **Jessie Knight Legacy Center** – The project team anticipates submitting the draft of their Materials Management Plan to UDEQ in the next couple of weeks. The state may take up to six weeks to review and approve the plan.
4. **Think Architecture** – No new updates. February 2021 update: Pending obtaining details on the Think Architecture building, work will begin soon on assessing the clean-up costs for the site and the cost analysis is expected to be completed by March.



If you have any questions about these projects or any other RDA questions, please contact me at 801-270-2428 or mgreenwood@murray.utah.gov.