



MURRAY
CITY COUNCIL

MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday August 1, 2017 in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

Council Members in Attendance:

Diane Turner, Chair	District #4
Dave Nicponski, Vice-Chair	District #1
Blair Camp	District #2
Jim Brass	District #3
Brett Hales	District #5

Others in Attendance:

Ted Eyre	Mayor	Jan Lopez	Council Administrator
Janet Towers	Chief Admin. Officer	Jennifer Kennedy	City Recorder
Pattie Johnson	Council Office	Danyce Steck	Finance
Frank Nakamura	City Attorney	Tim Tingey	ADS Director
Doug Hill	Public Services Director	Jim McNulty	Development Services Mgr.
Ryan Beck	Envision Utah	Kevin Leo	Envision Utah
Jennifer Brass	Resident	Stan Hoffman	Dakota Pacific Real Estate
Darrell Pehrson	Resident	Janice Strobel	Resident
Kathleen Stanford	Resident	Brent Barrett	Resident

Ms. Turner called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 5:15 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.

1. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Turner asked for action on the minutes from May 16, 2017. Mr. Brass moved approval with one correction. Mr. Camp seconded the motion. All were in favor.

2. Discussion Items

2.1 Envision Utah: Quality Communities – Jim McNulty and Ryan Beck

Envision Utah is a non-profit organization in partnership with Salt Lake County, and the Wasatch Choice for 2040 Vision, encouraging creation of centers throughout the valley that benefit walkability, housing affordability, and overall quality of life. With a current population of three million people and the expectancy for it to double statewide by 2050-2060 - the challenge for children of Utah residents to live, stay and work in Utah is concerning.

Mr. Beck described a brief history of early settlers who established small towns throughout the valley, such as, Murray, SLC, and Provo, once considered hubs for activities. Now referred to as 'centers', the street grid network still provides mixed use areas with retail, office and housing, all with similar historic design characteristics in close proximity. Over time the pattern of development for 'centers' changed from foot and horse travel, to an auto oriented pattern of development creating different types of centers.

Accessible with a strong concentration on parking design, Provo, old downtown Provo, Park City Main Street, Ogden, and Brigham City were noted as *historic* centers. Murray, City Creek, Holladay, Sugarhouse and the Ninth and Ninth area are more common mixed-use *revitalized* centers. *New* mixed-use centers were noted as Farmington Station, the Gateway and Riverwood in Provo. By combining office, housing and retail, in order to reduce auto trips, other means of transportation, such as, public transit, biking, and walking can become more prominent.

Land use modeling reflected approximately 40,000 acres of un-developed land in Salt Lake County, and 240,000 acres in Utah County. Therefore, it was easy to determine where future growth will occur. He noted most of Murray City's growth opportunity was considered redevelopment.

Mr. Beck reported the following information and statistics:

- Single-family home prices are up 8% since last year.
- Apartment rents are increasing 5% to 8% per year.
- Average rent for a single-family townhome, condo, or apartment is \$1,690 per month in SLC.
- Cost of living, still gives Utah a competitive edge, and was the second reason listed on a recent survey when Murray employees were asked what the reason was for people moving to Utah or accepting a job in Utah.
- During 2005 and 2006, 70% of construction in Utah was single family homes, however, currently construction is 50% multifamily units, and 50% single-family homes.

Mr. McNulty said Murray had an abundance of multifamily home construction in recent years, however, two large developments of single-family home construction by Ivory Homes, and Garbett Homes, totaling 220 units, would be exciting to see this year. Southwest Salt Lake County and Northern Utah County were mentioned as current areas with a big push for housing growth in the state.

Mr. Beck reported the average single family lot size in 2005 was approximately 9600 square feet, a quarter of an acre, however, lots are now 7,900 square feet and getting smaller.

Mr. Beck explained due to the popularity of on line shopping, a decrease of retail space was possible in the future. Plans for commercial construction along Redwood Road, as well as, other underperforming commercial locations may never happen and could be translated to housing zones.

A chart was explained associating low and high density, as related to per person capital costs. For example, the density at Daybreak, where the feel and appearance was very personal, infrastructure, such as, roads, libraries and schools, are shared costs. Statistics supporting the improvement of street connectivity reached by walking or biking was noted by using a map to compare the Daybreak area, where 88% of kids walk to school, compared to 17% in other areas. In addition, 50% of car trips are less than three miles, which is typically the furthest people would consider walking or biking. By cutting out automobile trips and increasing walkable and biking connectivity, concerns about poor air quality could be lessened as well. Areas that are built out would find street connectivity more challenging but possible. A street connectivity guide is available on the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WRFC) website for design help in providing a walkable community.

Mr. Camp commented about the population doubling in the future and noted it was important to realize the increase was statewide; Murray's population could not double unless the city expands its density upward, which he felt might not be a good plan for the city. Therefore, since statistics were noted by region, Murray would be only part of the average increase and he could not see the city planning for its population to double.

Ms. Turner agreed. Mr. Beck said it would be important for the Murray to pursue redevelopment opportunities. Mr. McNulty added the city currently has several opportunities for redevelopment, as well as, in the future.

Mr. Beck noted the bulk of the population increase would take place along the Wasatch Front, Vernal and Wasatch County, had rapid growth already. Mr. McNulty said another large growth area was Cedar Valley, in Eagle Mountain, which connects to Tooele. He believed this entire corridor was where Salt Lake City's children and their children would one day purchase homes, because there would be no other option in the valley.

2.2 Master Utility Agreement for UDOT I-15 Widening Project – Doug Hill

The process of adding an additional lane to Interstate 15 was underway, going southbound, between 2100 South and 12300 South, along with additional work at the I-15 and I-215 exchange. Plans to widen 7200 South between I-15 and 700 West are also scheduled.

A design build contractor will be hired by UDOT for the project. A request was made by UDOT for Murray to allow their contractor to design and construct utility work along the corridor Murray is responsible for, which would alleviate the city from hiring its own design build consultant in the area. The agreement for the request, which includes power, water, sewer and storm water.

Mr. Brass said his only concern was material and quality of work and he wondered if UDOT would build to the city's standards. Mr. Hill replied yes, and felt UDOT was good to work with because all

contractors were prequalified. With the council's approval Murray would have ultimate control of the construction area.

Ms. Turner read the agreement and wondered why UDOT would not reimburse the city for costs incurred by city personnel for design review. Mr. Hill stated, as part of the city's approval process, the city would not charge UDOT for the city's own staffing time.

Mr. Hales affirmed, since Murray was not paying UDOT for the work, reimbursement was not necessary. Mr. Hill confirmed it was not unusual because UDOT would be building Murray's utilities. He noted the city worked with other groups in the past, for utility designs and never required reimbursement for staff time.

Mr. Camp asked Mr. Hill if he had any concerns about the project. Mr. Hill had no concerns and stated he would recommend approval for a fairly simple improvement project.

2.3 Pedestrian Bridge over State Street – Tim Tingey

Mr. Tingey hoped to discuss options and get input from the council in order to attain immediate direction related to whether plans should move forward with the State Street Bridge. A federal Tiger Grant, submitted by UTA, was awarded to the city in the amount of \$3.2 million to help fund the amenity bridge. Considered for the downtown redevelopment project over a number of years, the bridge would connect the west and east sides of State Street.

Iconic to Murray's downtown, concepts of the bridge were presented as more than a pedestrian or bicycle type bridge; it would be wider, containing landscaping elements and benches throughout its extension.

Mr. Tingey explained options A and B, which were included with the original grant application process. He stressed the reason for needing immediate direction was due to the timeline of the Tiger Grant. The grant required the city to match 50% of the total cost of the bridge, therefore, in order to move forward with funding, a speedy decision was needed about which option was best suited.

During a recent open house, conceptual designs were shared, followed by public input and comments. Mr. Tingey said 15 people attended where four people preferred Option B, one person preferred Option A, and the rest did not provide a preference.

Mr. Tingey described the options and noted concerning issues with each one.

Option A - By working with Intermountain Health Care, (IHC) and their newly constructed facilities, connections to the bridge would be placed at the current city hall location on the east, and the liquor store location to the west. However, meetings held with the Utah State Liquor Store determined relocation possibilities could not be considered for at least seven years. In addition, a land purchase offer made to the state by IHC was rejected; therefore, Option A was very limited and almost impossible at this time.

Option B – The iconic bridge would connect further south of the liquor store on the west, and connect to the entrance area of Murray Park on the east. Due to challenges with the liquor store not willing to relocate, and the unknown scale of the bridge, Mr. Tingey felt Option B was a better choice from a redevelopment and economic perspective.

Currently, IHC was unwilling to commit to the overall project until exact height, width, landing and design factors were clearly understood, and because future amenities adjacent to the Transformation Center and hospital were uncertain. However, a preference for Option B was noted because it provided a trail connection between Murray Park and their property. The city would agree, however, two major concerns were noted with Option B.

1. Location of the bridge footing on the west side at the Smelter Site Overlay District, presents a number of environmental concerns affecting what is, and what is not permitted in the area. Mr. Hill explained a bridge of iconic magnitude, as described, would require significant pile driving; therefore, it was uncertain whether the Environmental Protection Agency, (EPA), and the Department of Environmental Equality, (DEQ), would allow the city to drive piles deep into the smelter site area. As a result, instead of using piles for bridge footings, the city may need to use more expensive large spread footings. In addition, not knowing size and appearance, as well as, having to relocate a number of existing utilities along State Street, the city could start the approval process and design proceedings only to find the project very costly in the end. Overall, because the bridge would require a landing further away from State Street, a longer, larger bridge span and higher costs were anticipated. The Tiger Grant is limited to \$3.2 million, so the city would incur costs over and above the 50% match, and final costs for the bridge could be \$7 million to \$10 million.
2. Location of the bridge footing on the east side is challenging, where open space is limited at the entrance to Murray Park on State Street. Mr. Hill questioned whether diminishing half of the State Street frontage and park entrance was a wise choice since the city valued open space. Assuming the structure would house elevators, accessible for the American Disabilities Act (ADA) and stairs as an alternative, substantial open space would be required - even more so to install a costly ramp system. A small less impressive trail connection, for trail users and bicycles could reduce, costs, however it would change the original concept and intent of the bridge.

Mr. Tingey reiterated an immediate decision from the council about Option B bridge, considering all associated obstacles was urgent, as well as, whether to pursue the Tiger Grant.

Mr. Camp said he was uneasy about the required timeframe for approval knowing UTA funding was limited to \$3.2 million. He did not want to be pushed into a project the city might not want after all. He wondered about the option to decline the Tiger Grant funding at this time. He felt accepting the grant might be putting the cart before the horse, and perhaps waiting would be best. Once costs and bridge details were determined, the city might reapply for another grant at the appropriate time.

Mr. Tingey replied, due to concerns and unknown details, the option was available to let UTA know the city was not prepared to move forward with a financial match at this time. He said the city could pursue design, location and appearance, without accepting grant funds. In addition, he felt continued communication with IHC would help them understand the benefits to IHC and the Transformation Center. Past conversations with IHC indicated possible donor opportunities for the bridge, if it was positive for their future plans.

Mr. Camp agreed with Mr. Hill, if the project resulted in a small bridge connection, current designs were too elaborate for a small trail connection and he could not imagine bicyclists taking bikes up an elevator or stairway.

Ms. Turner asked for exact timeline dates. Mr. Tingey replied location and environmental studies were needed within three weeks. Mr. Nicponski affirmed there were only two options to choose from.

Mayor Eyre said there was always Option C - which was to not build either one. He explained, two and half years ago when ideas for the downtown redevelopment started, elaborate designs and maps were envisioned as to what downtown could look like. He said it was quite intoxicating and although he did not want to make light of it, he would say it was really a beautiful design of downtown Disney. The bridge was the keystone and most obvious part of development ideas at the time, an iconic landmark statement. It became an extremely important part of the overall development plan to cap off all the new projects in the downtown area. However, he said, over the course of time, other cities such as, Draper and Sandy, planned on possibly constructing similar bridges as well. He felt those two cities were mainly constructing bridges for the same valid reason as Murray - visual impact. Currently, Murray's thinking about visual impact has evolved to the desire to build a bridge for 700,000 patients, their family members, and visitors who go to the Intermountain Medical Center (IMC). He noted if anyone saw the validity of Option B it was Mr. Brass because of a visit Mr. Brass made with Mr. Tingey to Rochester, New York where they saw an iconic bridge. He said Mr. Brass testified many times one of the greatest healing processes is to get people out of a hospital facility and into a beautiful environment with a safe and beautiful access instead of crossing on foot, or driving a car. The opportunity to get people out and across the street might out weigh an icon statement across State Street. It comes back to council and administration vision – where is Murray going? It has always been an incredibly unique city, one that stands apart because it does its own thing. Murray City might watch other cities construct large elaborate bridges. Although here in Murray, the direction might be to maintain its charm and character, which is how the city would remain the unique and little oasis, with a small town feel in the middle of a big metropolitan area.

Furthermore, he said this is what becomes unique in the future; we don't try to keep up with Sandy or Draper or match Taylorsville on everything they seem to achieve. We discover our own character and core city elements. It would be the council's responsibility to guide the city in that direction. Character and charm mean a lot, however, so does getting 700,000 people per year, into a beautiful healing environment. He expressed it was a tough decision to determine the direction of the city for many years in the future. The options should not be taken lightly and he felt confident it would be a well thought out decision for our city.

Ms. Turner responded if a healing environment was one of the main focuses, it would seem that funding should not come completely from Murray City. Additionally, she didn't know if a big iconic bridge as discussed, would maintain the city's charm.

Mayor Eyre explained in the beginning it was believed a minimum of three sources of funding would be available, IMC, the developers and Murray all willing to help financially. Now, land is the only thing they are willing to donate for the connection area - the situation has definitely narrowed down funding.

Mr. Brass favored the idea of connecting the park trail across State Street and said State Street was too big of a geographical barrier not to ignore. With good connections from one side to the other, development on both sides of the street could flourish.

Mr. Brass shared an experience about visiting Rochester, New York, where he crossed a large iconic bridge to the Mayo Clinic; the ramping system provided easy movement for a massive amount of people. Therefore, he felt a bridge with elevators and stairs would create a difficult access for bikers, pedestrians and those in wheelchairs. By his experience, wheelchairs limit space and can take up entire elevator car with another person pushing it. He felt without a ramp system, getting masses of people on, off, and across the bridge would not happen.

Mr. Brass continued suggesting Option D – a tunnel ramping down under State Street and up the other side with open space in the middle, offering natural light. Although it might be easier to construct, he felt underground access would be just as costly due to relocating underground utilities and having to dig deeper. To make a bridge work for pedestrians, bicyclers, and wheelchairs, ramping on and off was imperative. He noted for every inch of rise to a ramp, 12 inches of run was required, utilizing a greater area of space.

Mr. Nicponski asked what problems were involved with constructing a ramp on and ramp off system.

Mayor Eyre referenced an earlier discussion related to a culvert going under State Street but because of utilities and other complications the estimate was over \$6 million to tunnel underground.

Mr. Tingey agreed ramping on and off the bridge for Option B would take up significant green space at the park entrance location, as well as, space on the west side due to large footings for the base of the bridge.

Mr. Nicponski said since stairs and elevators were not easy for everyone to access, he favored connecting the ramp on concept even though the length would be longer than expected.

Mr. Tingey said conversations would occur over the next month related to a variety of elements including cost and design. Utilizing .2% sales tax dollars was considered, however, prioritizing Option

B with other planned projects was needed immediately in order to respond to the UTA grant deadline.

Ms. Steck confirmed, the \$3.2 million cost of the bridge was equivalent to one year of .2% sales tax dollars, which was significant. Original estimates for the bridge were noted at \$2 million.

Ms. Turner inquired what was needed in order to continue. Mr. Tingey said a decision on exact location to begin design procedures and environmental tests, as well as, conversations with UTA about how funds would be allocated.

Mr. McNulty explained UTA received a \$20 million grant to be utilized up and down the Wasatch Front. He speculated it would be a long time before another opportunity for funding came about if the city rejected the \$3.2 million match.

Ms. Steck felt the city would be in jeopardy of not receiving grant funds in the future if the city backed out at this time.

Mr. Nicponski felt strongly about pursuing the project and not losing the Tiger grant.

Ms. Turner was concerned about the exact cost to the city without having enough information and noted hidden costs typically exist with any project.

Mr. Hales was not comfortable making a quick decision at this time and felt more information and conversations were needed.

Mr. Tingey said a decision was needed in three to four weeks, therefore, further conversations could be scheduled for the upcoming council retreat. Ms. Lopez agreed it would give the council more time to consider the options. Council members agreed.

Mr. Brass noted the City's commitment to connect park trails to the Jordan River Parkway and said at some point those plans needed to be made, which involved a path across State Street.

Mr. Camp felt it was a huge concern having the bridge connect to the smelter overlay area. Mr. Brass noted the hospital parking lot was previously a business called Southern Exposure which was not included in the original overlay. Therefore, depending on how the bridge was constructed, digging deep may not present a problem.

Mr. Hill said there were ways to overcome issues and he was not implying construction was impossible in the overlay district; his main concern was the unknown cost. He noted Intermountain Medical Center constructed large buildings on the property, obviously successfully, and there was no reason the city could not do the same with a bridge. He shared concerns of engineers, related to piles utilized to build bridges and ways to avoid puncturing the water table. He said the project was possible, although until further analysis was made, it was hard to know what specific construction methods would be required, which could definitely increase costs.

The council agreed discussions would continue on August 24th in order to reach a decision. Mr. Tingey said details on cost, design and environmental studies would not be ready in time for the retreat, however, he felt the council had many things to contemplate now that project implications had been presented.

Mr. Camp said without having design details by August 24th, the ramp on - ramp off concept was something serious to consider, especially if it connects to the trail at the park entrance.

Mr. Hales was not concerned about design options, but felt he needed more time to contemplate all the repercussions.

Mr. Nicponski wondered if the city could secure the Tiger Grant, move forward with planning procedures, and pull out at a later time if the bridge was determined too costly.

Mr. Tingey replied, the \$3.2 million grant and the \$3.2 million match, was estimated when basic costs for the bridge were originally determined, however, additional implications such as the smelter issues, underground utilities, and location changes have created new challenges.

Mr. Brass said Option A was not an option anymore. Ms. Turner agreed Option B was the only choice and wondered if there was a rough cost estimate available for continuing the process.

Mr. Hill said estimating would be very hard, however, perhaps by providing the council with visual examples of other bridge type designs, may give some indication of cost. As an example, he shared a picture of a massive iconic bridge with a ramping system located at the University of Utah, and compared it to a simple trail type bridge. He said more examples of appropriately sized bridges would be shared at the retreat so the council could determine what was best. General numbers could be provided but it would not be reliable estimates. He felt if the city began the process with accepting the federal grant, started environmental studies, and the design process, only to suddenly back out, penalties would result.

Mr. Nakamura confirmed accepting federal funds was a major agreement, therefore, it would not be easy to back out.

Ms. Steck stated from her experience with UTA and other organizations, the city could back out, however, the cost would be significant and the city may never attain federal dollars again. She said the institutional memory of Region Eight was long, and harsh. In the past, UTA had returned money and as a result, lost major funding, which reflected poorly on UTA. A decision of this nature should be made in a timely manner. The amount offered to the city was 15% of UTA's total grant, and funds could be offered to another city, if there was not enough time for redistribution.

She explained, when funds are turned away and a timeline for a grant is not met, it is determined at the federal level that the need is not there. In addition, when the commitment is not honored it reflects poorly on the region from a federal standpoint, and again would reflect poorly on UTA. She continued, not only would the council need to decide on the bridge specifically, but on the overall picture of the downtown area. In addition, they should consider if more amenities are needed in the

parks, such as pavilion upgrades. With a limited amount of dollars to spend over the next few years, prioritizing all projects was crucial. As she measured the sales tax dollars, she was concerned funds were depleted already and was not sure the bridge was a priority of the council at this time.

Mr. Camp asked if Tiger Grant funds were considered a pass through, from the federal government and not money coming from the state. Ms. Steck explained, UTA was the recipient of federal dollars, and Murray City was the sub-recipient and there would be an expense for accepting federal funds.

3. Announcements: Ms. Lopez made the following announcements:

- Thursday, August 3, 2017, Chamber of Commerce luncheon to honor Jim and Jennifer Brass, and Mayor Eyre, located at the Cottonwood Club, 11:30 am.
- Monday, August 7, 2017, Heritage Center Volunteer Banquet, 11:30 am.
- Thursday, August 24, 2017, Council Retreat, located at City Hall in the conference room, 12:00 pm.

4. Adjournment: Ms. Turner adjourned the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

**Pattie Johnson
Council Office Administrator II**