

The Redevelopment Agency (RDA) of Murray City met on Tuesday, May 17, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. in the Murray City Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Members of the public were able to view the meeting via the live stream at www.murraycitylive.com or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>. Public comments could be made in person or by submitting comments via email at: rda@murray.utah.gov. Comments were limited to 3 minutes or less, and written comments were read into the meeting record.

RDA Board Members

Diane Turner, Chair
Rosalba Dominguez, Vice Chair
Pam Cotter
Kat Martinez
Garry Hrechkosy

Others in Attendance

Brett Hales, RDA Executive Director
G.L. Critchfield, City Attorney
Brooke Smith, City Recorder
Jared Hall, RDA Deputy Executive Director
Brenda Moore, Finance Director
Kyrene Gibbs, Y2 Analytics

Diane Turner called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

There were no minutes to approve in this packet.

Citizen Comments

Jen Kikel-Lynn - Resident

She is a fourth generation resident of Murray, and she actually lives on her family property. She also owns a Murray business, K Real Estate, also known as The Give Back Brokerage, which is also located in Murray and houses the Murray Chamber of Commerce. She is here because she wanted to give comments on the Murray Chapel, and then also the Murray City Hall. Being a resident and also having a business in Murray, she is very attached to Murray, she cares what happens in downtown Murray. She actually was married at the Murray Chapel in 1995, so she has an attachment to it. She also knows Susan Wright really well and it breaks her heart what has happened over all the years. She does care what happens with the Murray Chapel. Recently, she did submit a letter of intent to purchase Murray Chapel and the purpose of that would be to create a community center. That would be to connect the community and businesses, along with charities, in an area that she thinks the community deserves; she knows that she can do that. She has proven that she has done that in the two spaces that she currently owns, and she thinks that this property going to a Murray resident would just be such a blessing to the community, and she thinks to Susan Wright, and she knows she is that person. It is an emotional purchase she thinks as well because she does care, and her company is in a position that she can do that. She has financing ready, she has the ability to do it, and that's only part of the reason why she's here. She thinks the main thing she wants to deliver is that this would be a space for the community; it would not be for her business. She could utilize the basement maybe for her business, but the main purpose of the main floor would be for the community. It could be a space that could be rented out and given back. She actually would want to call it The Give Back and Connect Center because this would be a space given back to the community. She didn't think she'd get emotional about this. She is also here for the city hall. She went to elementary school here when it was Arlington, and she has a scar on her hand to prove that she was rolling down the hill in the back and got a piece of glass stuck in her hand. She has great memories of being here before they were transferred to Parkside Elementary. Again, she cares what happens to the city hall as well. She brings that up because she knows the city is looking for a real estate broker to

represent the city on both sales, and she does have a commercial designation. She would love to have a part in the sale of the Murray City Hall, but also the chapel; again, the chapel is a personal purchase.

RDA Budget Update

Brenda Moore shared the schedule and noted that the RDA budget has been included in all the budget documents everyone has been receiving, even though it is approved by this body and not the city council. Tonight, when they talk about the budget in the city council meeting, they are not talking about approving the RDA budget, that will happen on June 21st in another RDA meeting where there will be a public hearing for it to be presented and voted on. Basically, in the RDA budget is receipt of the TIF funds of the property tax. She put as an expense a portion of that property tax that should be used for low income housing, and then in the CBD district they put in \$100,000 of miscellaneous expense in case of appraisals or things that could be needed in that area like environmental studies, etc. This budget also includes the budgets to send to the school district and people they owe money to for Fireclay, because there are contracts out there that they need to repay still.

Consideration of a resolution authorizing an agreement to engage a real estate brokerage and marketing firm for services related to the Murray Chapel Properties.

Jared Hall said this resolution is to authorize the city to engage a real estate brokerage to find a buyer or work with a buyer for the Murray Chapel. The resolution that the board has in front of them references some deed restrictions that would be part of any purchase of the property. This has been talked about before, but the buyer would have to agree to not demolish, change significantly, or remove the building. It would also be used and not left vacant, and that would be for a term of 50 years. The city would also retain the first right of refusal on sale, which means if someone is unable to keep the building up, the city has the right to buy the building back. This just moves us forward on the potential sale of the Murray Chapel, but with those deed restrictions in place.

Garry Hrechkosy asked to confirm that the building can't be sold for 50 years, but at that point someone could tear it down.

Mr. Hall responded that is the way it is written as he reads it.

G. L. Critchfield said that detail would be worked out with the buyer. It could be for any length of time, but it has to be a reasonable amount of time, not forever.

Mr. Hrechkosy asked to confirm that the new owner would have to keep the building.

Mr. Critchfield responded yes.

MOTION: Ms. Dominguez moved to approve the resolution for an agreement to engage a real estate brokerage and marketing firm for services related to the Murray Chapel Properties. SECONDED by Mr. Hrechkosy.

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| Mr. Hrechkosy | Aye |
| Ms. Martinez | Aye |
| Ms. Cotter | Aye |
| Ms. Dominguez | Aye |
| Ms. Turner | Aye |

Motion Passed 5-0

Consideration of a resolution authorizing an agreement to engage a real estate brokerage and marketing firm for services related to the Murray City Hall Properties.

Mr. Hall stated that this resolution is very similar to the one for the Murray Chapel. The RDA board is not as far into discussions about a potential sale, but they felt that the time had come to start those discussions and look at the future since the new city hall will be completed early next year. To be ahead of that schedule, and not lose time, they'd like to get a resolution in place to allow them to start exploring those possibilities with the real estate brokerage as well.

Ms. Turner thinks it's a good idea to be proactive, rather than waiting until the last second.

Mr. Critchfield added that it's possible they might combine and have one real estate broker do both properties. They just wanted to make sure they separate those out so that the RDA board is clear that they will have a real estate broker for each of the properties.

Mr. Hrechkosy asked to confirm there will be no deed restrictions on this property when it sells.

Mr. Critchfield responded that is correct.

Ms. Dominguez noted that if that's something the board wants, it would be fair to say there will be discussion on that as well.

Mr. Hall noted that the resolution wouldn't necessarily preclude that in the future.

MOTION: Mr. Hrechkosy moved to approve the resolution for an agreement to engage a real estate brokerage and marketing firm for services related to the Murray City Hall Properties. **SECONDED** by Ms. Martinez.

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| Mr. Hrechkosy | Aye |
| Ms. Martinez | Aye |
| Ms. Cotter | Aye |
| Ms. Dominguez | Aye |
| Ms. Turner | Aye |

Motion Passed 5-0

Y2 Analytics

Ms. Turner said this is a review of the final draft of the public opinion survey for the area between State Street to Poplar Street, and 4800 South to 5th Avenue within the Central Business District (CBD) urban renewal area.

Kyrene Gibbs from Y2 Analytics is here to go over the questionnaire draft with the board to make sure that everyone is aware of the questions that are being asked, and make sure they haven't missed any specific areas of interest that the council wants to understand as they are exploring the residents' attitudes towards downtown Murray in general, specifically Block One. The board received a copy of the questionnaire draft in the meeting packet, and it is available to view in the attachments of this meeting. She continued by giving an overview of the structure of the survey and offered to address specific questions if needed when they came up. For the flow of the survey overall they started with a few warm up questions to get residents in the right frame of mind for answering some more specific questions about attitudes towards the city, their quality of life, and things that affect them on a day to day basis. They have

a few things that are a good basis for comparison from other cities, as well as some good softball questions to get residents warmed up and ready to answer some of the more difficult or nuanced questions later in the survey. The first couple pages of the survey are those introductory questions. Starting on page 2, towards the bottom, they start to ask specifically about downtown. They are presenting residents with a map to see what area they consider to be downtown Murray as they think that is instructive when they are talking about what downtown Murray is and what it means to residents. It also asks residents to evaluate the downtown area across a variety of metrics for the next couple of pages. On page 4 is where they start to get into Block One specifically, asking how important various aspects of Block One are to residents, how they would rate things currently, and what they would like to see in Block One or the surrounding area as the city is looking to develop the space. They also asked residents whether they would support investing in the Block One area; at the bottom of page 4 and top of page 5 is where they start to get into that specifically. They are presenting this scenario to residents: the city currently owns the Block One property, would residents support or oppose the redesign of that block. After that, they moved on to getting some open ended responses as to why they would support or oppose that redesign. They then presented residents with a few tradeoffs because it's important to understand not just whether residents would like to see that area redeveloped, but whether residents are willing to pay to see that redevelopment. They are trying to get a sense of whether residents would like to see property tax levels remain stable and have the city sell that block to a private developer so there's less city investment, but also less city control; or if residents would rather have an increase in property taxes to support the redevelopment of the Block One area. They also have some priorities for the types of things the residents would like to see in Block One if it were redeveloped; how important various aspects of potential development are, along with a few more tradeoff questions looking at the types of things that could fit into the downtown area in Murray. They are talking about open space versus commercial or residential space, if residents are interested in seeing more restaurants, including what types of restaurants they are looking for in terms of possibly more chain type restaurants or more local mom and pop type places. All of that is to help understand the character that residents would like to see in the downtown Murray area. The last "heavy lifting" area of the survey is a little more difficult to explain in a word document draft format. She went on to discuss page 7, where there is an exercise which basically presents residents with a complete package made up of a variety of components. All of those components are randomized so they are presenting a unique package, pitting it against another unique package, and asking residents to choose which package they prefer rather than having them evaluate their priorities and preferences for each individual aspect available. You can see on page 8 they have all of the various aspects of each option, and those are the features they would be varying. Then there are different levels within each of those features, for instance under appearance they could have storefronts less than 20 feet away from the road surface, essentially right on the street front, or buildings set back a little bit further from the sidewalk and road surface. Those features would be randomly assigned, along with others. The options with which residents are presented are, again, unique combinations of all the different aspects of what development downtown could look like. Instead of asking residents to rate how important each of these aspects are, they just make a choice between package 1 and package 2, and that exercise is repeated a few times. It is relatively simple for residents and survey respondents in general to understand and pick which package they would most prefer. Then, on the back end there are some statistical analysis tools they can use to help determine which individual feature options were driving residents' preferences. They will be able to get more granular results by asking residents relatively simple questions and trying to reduce the cognitive burden as much as they can while getting as much bang for their buck for this particular exercise. Page 9 gets into some image tests. They have asked questions about what types of things residents would prefer, what features of downtown they would like to see. She thinks the visual preferences will be really helpful in understanding what residents mean when they think of tall buildings, or different stories of buildings.

This includes different images of streetscapes, architectural styles, etc. They look at those questions early in the survey when they're asking explicitly, and implicitly later in the survey when they ask residents to choose between images in the visual preference test. They also want to do a little bit of comparison with some comparable commercial centers in other neighboring cities, so they chose the 9th and 9th area in Salt Lake City, the Holladay Downtown area, and the Sugarhouse "commercial center" as potential sources of inspiration. They will have residents indicate which pieces of those images or aspects of those downtown spaces they find appealing or dislike about the areas. The last couple of pages are just demographic questions to ensure a representative sample of residents according to the census population estimates for the city of Murray. She then asked the council if it sounds like there is anything they missed.

Ms. Martinez asked if Ms. Gibbs could talk about what Y2 has to keep in mind when they create a survey, that someone in the general public might not be aware of.

Ms. Gibbs said that some of the guiding principles with thinking about survey design are that they want to make the questions accessible. If they need to provide context for something to make sure everyone is on the same page before asking a survey question, they should probably think carefully about whether they should ask that question. In this case, there are some things that they need to provide specific context about, like explaining what they mean when they reference Block One. In that case, there are usually visual aids, some sort of background information that they will provide to residents. The next principle that they use to guide their survey design is simplicity, but also comprehensiveness. They want to ask the question in the most basic way possible while getting the data needed. If they are really interested in what residents in one part of the city think about a particular issue or aspect of downtown, it is a lot easier for them to do the geocoding on the back end to make sure residents in this spot around Block One really care about X, Y and Z without asking if they live near Block One and asking specific questions. The other thing they always have to consider is that they aren't asking leading questions, to the extent possible. They are aware that there are groups of residents that might like them to phrase a question a certain way, or that will accuse them of phrasing them a certain way, to get an outcome that is either supportive or antagonistic to their goals. Y2's goal, as non-Murray residents and not being elected officials, is to collect representative data; they will be sure they are framing the questions as objectively as possible.

Mr. Hrechkosy asked how long they think it will take for someone to fill out this survey.

Ms. Gibbs said they are looking at about a 15 minute survey.

Mr. Hrechkosy asked if that is something, in her opinion, that she thinks will get a lot of participation in.

Ms. Gibbs said generally speaking, when surveying Utah residents and the survey is sponsored by an entity they recognize, they tend to find that residents will bear with them for up to 18 minutes; at that point they tend to see a lot of drop off. They definitely don't have room to add more questions without removing what's already on the survey.

Ms. Dominguez asked if they could discuss how they would go about selecting those who are participating in the survey.

Ms. Gibbs said the participant selection process is an address based sample of addresses in Murray, which includes homes, apartments, condos, a full range of household types. They will send those invitations via either email or printed mail to randomly selected households. Generally speaking they have to send about 10 times as many invitations as they expect to get responses, so they are looking at sending around 10,000 invitations so they can get 800 to 1000 responses.

Ms. Turner said that was her questions as well, how many they are sending out and how many they expect to have returned.

Ms. Dominguez noted that she appreciated being able to have this conversation, and seeing what other cities have done for their areas and looking at those surveys. She personally would have loved a little bit more interaction in person but given the situation she thinks this is a good start because they've never done this before.

Ms. Turner said that since there were no more questions, Ms. Gibbs and Y2 can go ahead as planned.

Ms. Gibbs said they will go ahead and get those invitations into the field post Memorial Day weekend most likely. They might go out this week, but then with Memorial Day breaking up the fielding period, the best bet is probably to wait until after that holiday weekend. They plan on having data collection done by mid-June.

Ms. Dominguez asked when they will be back with the survey results.

Ms. Gibbs said they will have data collection done by mid-June, and they usually need three to five days for the data cleaning, weighting and ensuring their numbers look right in terms of the demographic composition of the survey. They will also be monitoring those things as they are in field with the data collection. About three to five days after that fielding process, they will deliver initial results, and then they will have a full presentation to bring before this group before the end of June.

Ms. Turner thanked Ms. Gibbs for coming. She then asked Mr. Hill if he had anything else to add before closing the meeting.

Mr. Hill had nothing to add, but said it might be a good idea to go over meeting to discuss the zoning for the MCCD.

Ms. Turner recognizes that can't be done right now.

Mr. Hall said there is an RDA planning meeting coming up Thursday of next week, and they have the maps the group asked for of the city owned properties ready. He will give that to them at the planning meeting and then they can talk about what to do with that going forward.

Mr. Hrechkosy asked about information on how much longer the RDA is in effect, what happens when the RDA ends, and what's the typical amount time it takes for them to start seeing tax dollars from a project to the RDA.

Mr. Hall said all those factors are different depending on the RDA area. Brenda had some good information about that not too long ago, and he will forward that to Mr. Hrechkosy.

Mr. Hrechkosy said that as they think about the future, and what they have left, that would be good information to have.

Mr. Hall said that the shortest fuse on anything that's really active and imperative right now is in the Central Business District RDA area, which is where they are sitting right now.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:31 p.m.