



MURRAY
CITY COUNCIL

MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL RETREAT

The Murray City Municipal Council met for a retreat on Thursday, August 24, 2017 in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

Council Members in Attendance:

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

Others in Attendance:

Janet Towers	Deputy Mayor	Jan Lopez	Council Administrator
Tim Tingey	ADS Director	Jennifer Kennedy	City Recorder
Pattie Johnson	Council Office	Danyce Steck	Finance
Gil Rodriguez	Fire Chief	Jeff Gochnour	Public Cottonwood Partners
Craig Burnett	Police Chief	Jon Harris	Deputy Fire Chief
Jim McNulty	Development Services Mgr.	Kim Fong	Library Director
Frank Nakamura	City Attorney	Blaine Haacke	General Manager, Power
G.L. Critchfield	Deputy City Attorney	Mike Terry	Human Resource Director
Trae Stokes	City Engineer	Mary Ann Kirk	Cultural Arts
Kathleen Stanford	Resident	Brent Barrett	Resident
Curtis Sterling	Resident/business owner	Lori Edmunds	Cultural Arts
Stan Hoffman	DPRE	Sally Hoffelmeyer Katz	Resident
Elliot Setzer	Resident	Janice Strobell	Resident

Ms. Turner called the meeting to order at 12:30 pm and welcomed those in attendance. Ms. Turner noted the importance of the meeting and shared her appreciation for Mr. Tingey in compiling all of the information for their continued knowledge.

1. Murray City Center District (MCCD) Vision, Goals and Objectives – Tim Tingey

Mr. Tingey reviewed the MCCD Design Guidelines, shared a history of the MCCD Ordinance, and explained the Downtown Historic Overlay District was in place prior to the adoption of the MCCD ordinance. In 2008, development possibilities were explored with Gerding Edlen Development, an architectural group from Portland, Oregon, who were interested in promoting a vision and shaping thoughts in preparation for developing Murray's downtown.

Two things prompted the original vision, the development of Intermountain Medical Center, and close proximity to Front Runner and Murray Central Trax Station. Both provided opportunities for the community, and future prospects to enhance the city.

Concerned property owners had issues about the Downtown Historic Overlay District (DHOD), particularly the component focusing on historic preservation. They wanted to see a change because nothing was happening to develop the downtown area. Mr. Tingey explained very strict DHOD historic preservation elements impacted the content of the current Design Guidelines that ultimately led to the council adopting the policies of the MCCD ordinance in 2011.

Incorporated into the ordinance were concepts of Smart Growth principles, which are planning and transportation theories. Principles include strengthening and directing development in existing communities, eliminating sprawl, creating distinctive communities with a strong sense of place, providing mixed land uses, as well as, creating a range of housing opportunities and take advantage of compact buildings.

An extensive public process took place as part of the ordinance adoption, which included thirteen public meetings, multiple meetings with the planning commission and the city council – where hundreds of people attended to provide input on core elements prior to its approval.

Making good decisions about future development in the MCCD, adding value to our community while maintaining the community feel has come up in conversations. As the planning process continues, getting further direction at the council level would be helpful in moving forward at this time.

Mr. Tingey reviewed the vision and goals, explained conceptual maps of the MCCD area, and reviewed the ordinance language and purpose, by sharing a power point to provide a current update.

The vision was to create density with a complimentary scale design to the hospital, which is dense in height itself. Components embedded into the ordinance depict State Street with open spaces, a parking structure and dense vertical development that continues west towards the TRAX station and Poplar Street. Thoughts of a performing art center and new city hall building were highlighted as originally planned.

Mr. Tingey recalled conversations with Murray residents, Kim Fong and the Murray Library Board over the last six months, about the need to create density in the downtown area and provide more opportunities for residents. A common fear was noted about the downtown dying out, due to the

lack of continued development. Although this had not happened yet he believed certain areas would become a detriment to the city, rather than an asset, if opportunity was not taken to facilitate investments.

Mr. Tingey read the purpose statement in Section 17.170.010 of City Code where the MCCD would provide:

- Commercial, civic and cultural center for the community and a new mixed use district, to enhance physical, social and economic connections by redeveloping “downtown” Murray City, resulting in a more vibrant environment.
- A pedestrian oriented design, promoting development opportunities with increased residential and commercial densities.
- A development model that promotes sustainable compact mixed use development and transit oriented uses with neighborhood oriented commercial, and restaurant components.
- Urban design, appearance and streetscapes.
- Compatibility of land uses, and historic preservation.

He stressed the definite existence of the historic preservation requirement within the ordinance, which was taken into consideration during the planning process, and at several meetings with the History Advisory Board. Based on input from the History Advisory Board in 2010, historic preservation recommendations included certain historic buildings, which the city would strive to acquire. Not all historic buildings would be retained. Mr. Tingey felt the RDA promoted historic preservation successfully, because the city acquired and owned four suggested buildings; the Townsend home, the Cahoon Mansion, the Murray Baptist Church and the Murray Theater, with the hope to renovate, preserve and adapt them for reuse. would be achieved.

It was important the council kept in mind and understood the ordinance focused on differentiating old buildings from new buildings. Much criticism was received from certain individuals, who said recent development was not compatible with historic appearance and preservation, such as, the Homes 2 Suites, which does not look historic. Therefore, Mr. Tingey noted recommendations made by historic architects in the Design Guidelines, stating specifically that “new construction should differentiate from old buildings”. He explained the combination would blend and create enhancement to the downtown. For example, he shared a photo of downtown Philadelphia, illustrating the collaboration of historic buildings, right next to a Home 2 Suites, which was similar in Murray.

Mr. Camp understood the ordinance to differentiate old buildings from new construction, however, he wondered, by ordinance, would a developer be restricted to constructing modern buildings only, or, did the ordinance encourage the replication of historic structures.

Mr. Tingey replied, historic replication was encouraged, although, from the very beginning of the planning process, the city never intended to build everything to look historic.

Everything Mr. Tingey described was part of the city’s original vision. He stressed, it should be understood how design relates to the type and scale of development, and how development looks and feels was a big part of achieving and promoting the original vision. When reviewing City code,

he reminded the council, while waiting for a development proposal, the visuals he shared were strictly conceptual, attained over time and not definite. The following sections of City code were explained and highlighted.

Section: 17.170.010.

The focus on a pedestrian experience would provide attractive design features, compatible architecture and streetscapes, similar to streets in downtown Park City, where people walk about easily and dine outside. In addition, buffering parking, and enhancing green corridors and trail connections are an important part of the pedestrian focus. For example, a 50 foot buffer is currently required off of Little Cottonwood Creek, to protect and preserve those areas.

Capitalizing on transit opportunities was noted to promoted alternate modes of transportation. Mr. Tingey said the city already had strong components of rail, bicycle and walking amenities in the area. Transportation was addressed previously with the county when a performing arts center was at one time considered, and traveling from Front Runner and the Trax station to downtown areas were considered short distances.

Section 17.170.110 – Building Design and Scaling

Primary entrances to buildings must be clearly identifiable and must be oriented to face the street, plaza, or pedestrian way. Entries shall have a pedestrian scale façade, be covered with canopies or awnings, or have recessed entries. Entrances must meet all local, state and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility requirements; corner building entries are required on both street facades.

Functional entries must appear at least once every 75 feet on average. Therefore, the city would avoid large buildings without windows, and without entrances not conducive to pedestrian use. Entries must face a public street, square or plaza, but not a parking lot.

All front setbacks, if proposed, should be landscaped and buildings are to be placed closer to the street, however, some elements allow for a plaza component.

Unlike zoning designations south of 5300 South, where car dealerships are located, off street parking in the MCCD must be placed to the side or rear of buildings, and not in the front setback area.

Side-lot areas between non-adjoining buildings and the property line, should be developed as parking, plaza, landscaped open space or a landscaped walkway with access to sidewalks.

Blank walls shall not occupy over 50% of a principal frontage, therefore, windows, or glass entry components are required every 30 feet.

Section: 17.170.120 – Height Regulations.

There are no height restrictions in the district except as provided in the following:

- A. For new buildings located west of State Street, and south of 4800 South, a minimum height standard of 40 feet, or four stories is required, where parking and land provide the parameters for the building.

Mr. Tingey said this is a large component to the ordinance. Potentially, a 20-story building could be constructed, west of State Street, although the parameters would determine whether there was enough land to accommodate it - along with adequate parking. In addition, large open parking spaces are restricted, therefore, constructing parking structures, or building within the envelope of the structure itself, would be required in order to attain this type of density on the west side.

- B. The height of a structure located adjacent to a residential zoning district, may not exceed 50 feet within 150 feet of residential zoning district.

Mr. Tingey said the council adopted a change two years ago to the MCCD, limiting development on Center Street, therefore, buildings located north of Court Avenue adjacent to Center Street, shall not be erected greater than 35 feet. In summary, great density is permitted west of State Street.

- C. Buildings over 10-stories high, must have a podium, which addresses the pedestrian nature of the street. Therefore, buildings up to three stories, would require a podium setback. The tower portion shall step back.

Mr. Brass said the more he observed the downtown area, he wondered how high up the city wanted to go. He favored the step back design so that in the pedestrian oriented area the sun was not blocked from city streets. He felt the step back of a podium would be less impactful, because trees could be seen from a distance without a perpetual shadow that comes with high rise buildings.

Mr. Tingey explained this was the reason for the podium step back requirement - to avoid a situation similar to Manhattan, where areas in the city never see sunshine. Mr. Brass noted areas in Chicago, where canyon like winds come off the lake and swirl around the shaded city creating a very cold environment – he did not want to see this in Murray.

Mr. Tingey said the ordinance requires a step back on a three-story building constructed on the west side, however, buildings located east of State Street are exempt from the minimum height requirement. In addition, public or quasi-public utility buildings and structures are exempt from the minimum height regulations, due to a functionality requirement with the new fire station.

Mr. Brass noted podium depth requirements were not mentioned, and felt it was important the ordinance clarify their size because podiums are not equal to the depth of a balcony. Mr. Tingey agreed.

Mr. Camp questioned whether the podium section of buildings must be connected to the building. Mr. Tingey confirmed podiums are not separate structures.

Mr. Tingey read key development goals established when planning began, which were to: enhance the integrity of Murray City, maintain historic fabric, create a true downtown and city center with

hospital and transportation, and create vibrant neighborhoods for housing, work and play. Also, provide a mix of housing quality, provide an attractive architecture and streetscape; and capitalize on transit opportunities and increase opportunities for growth.

Part of the challenge with developing Murray's downtown is the number of small parcels involved, and the assembly of several properties needing to occur in order to provide a substantial development. Mr. Tingey said this was why there was no significant development over the last ten to twenty years, therefore, allowing the required density would promote quality redevelopment projects.

In summary, vision elements for the MCCD are: density, historic preservation, and sustainability, requiring components for Silver LEED Standards, architectural building materials, transportation and streetscape. Project opportunities include medical and general offices, convention centers, theaters, grocery stores, hotels and retail space, including lower level commercial and upper level residential.

Mr. Tingey said if the council was uncomfortable with density requirements, guidelines could be reconsidered if restricting density or setting minimum and maximum heights in any area was felt necessary. However, he stressed the framework behind the vision and goals for the downtown was set with the design guidelines. With recent questions and concerns about the city plans, he felt details needed to be addressed as to whether the city intended to accomplish original goals.

Mr. Brass said the vision was eight years old, which was originally centered on a performing arts facility and no longer part of city planning. The downtown area is his district, he resides in the area and drives along 4800 South several times a day. He wondered if it was a good idea to remove old buildings, and would their disappearance take from the charm and uniqueness, as Mayor Eyre recently described the city. He wondered if their disappearance would significantly alter Murray's character by becoming another Sandy or South Salt Lake. He would not limit density, but believed there was an appropriate place for it and felt more thought was needed to fit it all together and truly be pedestrian friendly. With too many Class C office buildings, the city would go dark at 5:00 p.m., which did not make for a welcoming downtown walkable community. Originally, a performing arts center and city hall would exist, along with residential buildings interestingly connected, including a parking structure. Therefore, with residents living in the downtown area, a human presence into late hours was what he wanted to see, as well as, another theater in addition to the Murray Theater. He noted the Hoffman building and felt safe restoration could provide spectacular loft apartments with wonderful mountain views on the second and third floors. He stated he did not want concrete canyons, like Chicago, but desired something in-between what the city has now, and a more lively area. To encourage human interest, he imagined small court yard areas along the street, with an open air feel and outdoor dining on warm evenings - therefore, solid walls of tall office buildings with glass fronts should be avoided.

Ms. Turner agreed gathering places after work are valuable for a community, whether dining or for entertainment. In addition, economic development would thrive with a pedestrian friendly focus, by encouraging people to visit downtown during evening hours.

Mr. Tingey said plaza setbacks for creating outdoor areas was not a required component, although the ordinance could be changed.

Mr. Brass felt if it was not a requirement, developers should be encouraged to create them since those types of areas were allowed.

Mr. Camp recalled past comments about the vision, made by Mr. Stokes and Mr. Hill, related to how traffic would be impacted with increased density. With only State Street and two lane roads in the downtown, he felt increased density, as it related to traffic, should be questioned before encouraged and decisions should be made carefully.

Mr. Stokes agreed and said a higher density in a city, means more people with more vehicles, so encouraging alternative transit was important. He felt significant improvements were needed to effectively move traffic in and out of the area. He said the downtown was already a busy area and the thought of higher density could be overwhelming to traffic flow in the intersection, which is not desirable.

Mr. Brass agreed and reported traffic studies indicate when cities increase density, typically all existing intersections fail with traffic flow. He mentioned the Fireclay area and said traffic flow was already difficult to maneuver through, and getting rescue vehicles into the area was a challenge during high traffic.

Mr. Stokes confirmed the situation in Fireclay and said solutions to mitigate the problem were possible, however, even with recent modeling of high volume density, when high volume developments were added, significant traffic issues would be seen at Vine and 4800 South immediately.

Mr. Brass said neighbors indicated a desire to enjoy new places in the downtown, including those who wanted to preserve historic elements - he was not implying development and increased density was all negative. He felt something should be done soon because the downtown was stagnating, and parking was lacking, which prevented interested businesses from locating to Murray. He added it's essential to look at the area as a whole and make careful decision for the future because they are permanent. The beauty of the situation was knowing how financially sound Murray is, which meant the city really did not need to change anything for the sake of change.

Mr. Nicponski asked if there were plans for an apartment complex. Mr. Tingey said currently, there was nothing proposed along State Street. Mr. Nicponski asked about the construction of a parking garage and where it would be located. Mr. Tingey explained parking was required behind office buildings. Originally, the conceptual idea was to construct a parking garage first.

Mr. Tingey said challenges come with any project when the vision no longer meshes with market conditions. He confirmed the vision was eight years old and although the process seemed slow, a couple of projects were complete. He stressed in order to achieve exactly what the city wanted - a current clear vision was imperative.

Mr. Brass understood in order to create a financially viable downtown selecting the right projects from the start was key. However, he said choosing projects to attract additional favorable elements, was more important than constructing projects that deter people. He noted the desperate need for a new city hall and if done correctly, it would attract other investments with the right amenities. He described millennials, who prioritize their personal lives, before their careers; therefore, socializing in the evening with friends and having places to gather was a high concern for them. He said if millennials are the city's customers, it is vital to give them what they want, and typically they want to spend time downtown with friends.

Mr. Tingey agreed and said due to changing demographics, big box retail is no longer working, as reported last year during the International Retail Convention; therefore, amenity oriented retail is a national trend and shopping is done at popular locations or on line.

Mr. Brass noted Fashion Place Mall was a very reliable concept, we would not want to hurt, although, a decade old concept should be reconsidered for future projects. In addition, he wondered knowing the trend, was it wise to construct something destined to fail the moment it started.

Mr. Camp favored a new popular place to shop, where people enjoy eating outside on a plaza - the Maceys grocery store. Therefore, he wondered with the minimum height requirement would flexibility be limited. For example, with a desire to increase density, and due to the four-story requirement, opportunity might be missed if a three-story structure was proposed.

Mr. Tingey explained the Smart Growth principles of compact design elements promoted urban center type development, therefore, the reason for the four-story requirement was because it pushes the project towards urban development - rather than something seen in a suburban area. Whether three or four stories high, the requirement was benchmarked from other projects across the country where four stories matched the urban description best. Mr. Tingey said Mr. Camp had a good question and he could change the requirement if needed.

Mr. Brass agreed the opportunity should be available to reconsider the four-story requirement. He explained a retail space located in Salt Lake City housing three businesses: a landscape facility, a small Italian restaurant and a gelato dessert shop. All were connected and within walking distance to the neighborhood. The concept might be favorable to Murray, as well as, three-story buildings.

Mr. Tingey commented the ordinance allowed for the same type of retail development along the east side of State Street, as well as, two and three story developments.

Mr. Nicponski felt regardless, the ordinance favored a walkable community.

Mr. Tingey appreciated new ideas and said the ordinance allowed for a good mix of density in the area, however, he reiterated, requirements could be reevaluated on the west side of State Street. With recent grant funding approval from the Wasatch Front Regional Council, small area studies and planning near Front Runner and the TRAX station would begin. A study of the node component could potentially benchmark three and four story buildings.

Mr. Camp said with many building projects going up in the area, he wondered how long the study would take; he asked if a moratorium should be considered. If the study was not completed until after the area was built out, it was not useful.

Mr. Tingey said the study would be ongoing for the next few months to determine market details and node components and would be completed by the first part of 2018.

Mr. Nicponski wondered if the city would break ground in 2018. Mr. Tingey felt construction for city hall could begin in late 2017 and other projects would follow in 2018.

Mr. Tingey said he would continue reevaluating the requirements because the council should feel comfortable with density, podium depth, and minimum and maximum building heights.

2. Property Acquisition Update and Discussion – Tim Tingey

Three types of properties were depicted on a map related to acquisition and public facility use in the downtown area. 1.) Land acquired through the RDA, 2.) Land owned by the city, and 3.) Land yet to be acquired. Development projects such as the city hall, library, and fire station, were noted, and the renovation of the Murray Mansion and Murray Theater were noted for future development. The hope is to locate the fire station on the UTA property where negotiations were underway.

Mr. Tingey said the last four properties were needed to complete final acquisition. 1.) The Day Attorney's office property, which would be acquired in exchange for city owned street property. 2.) The Verizon Wireless cell tower property, which would be acquired soon, with plans to relocate the tower. 3.) The small Strauser property, where there was no progress at this time. 4.) The Fraternal Order of Eagles (FOE) property, which is the final piece of land to acquire and where positive progress occurred during the month of August. The FOE found a favorable relocation site in Taylorsville, therefore, after a public process in September and a new contract with Taylorsville complete, land acquisition would be possible.

Mr. Tingey summarized, moving forward the council would need to consider the following major issues; whether final acquisitions should be pursued, the location of the new city hall, the location of other public facilities, and designating additional funding to purchase the FOE property, which reflected a cost increase.

Ms. Turner asked about the cost increase to acquire the FOE property, and wondered if preparations were made. Mr. Tingey said the city was prepared and an appraisal was scheduled to determine actual value; he explained the FOE could substantiate relocation costs, therefore, the city would need additional funding approved by the council.

Mr. Brass felt the situation was not unprecedented and noted a similar instance in order to eliminate a nuisance when the Grecian Gardens property was acquired. Mr. Nicponski said the property should be purchased regardless. Mr. Tingey commented the opportunity to acquire the parcel was closer, which was not the case a few months ago, therefore, steps should be taken to pursue acquisition.

Ms. Steck reported in anticipation of the increase, additional funding was already included in the 2017-2018 fiscal budget amendment.

Mr. Tingey reiterated after these four remaining properties were purchased - no additional property acquisition would be necessary.

3. Fire Station Development Update – Tim Tingey and Chief Rodriguez

In order to provide adequate emergency response for the future population of Murray, planning was well thought out. Chief Rodriguez explained paramedic and ambulance response, was never considered part of a fire station years ago, but is now common place. With city growth, additional staff and response units would meet the needs of the city's future citizens. The following comparison was shown to reflect the difference between Murray City in 1979 and Murray City in 2017.

	1979	2017
Stations	2	4
Population	25,000	49,230 – Doubled
Housing units	9,500	19,181 – Doubled
Call Volume	1,437	7,000 – Increased 5X
Firefighters	1 Part-time 17 Volunteers 22 Full-time	2 Part-time 0 Volunteers 61 Full-time – Tripled, replacing volunteers

Mr. Harris noted the reason comparisons were done from 1979 to 2017, was because Station #81 was built in 1979.

Chief Rodriguez noted the General Plan current population at 49,000, and the expected increase by 25% in 13 years to 61,000. Accordingly, housing units are expected to increase 20%. Therefore, in order to provide efficient response - the station must also expand. Fire fighters will need to increase 25%, from 61 to 76 full-time, and an increase to call volume is expected at approximately 8,800 calls. How response should be handled was a constant discussion when deciding on staff increases. For example, should a fire engine be sent out on all calls, or, could just one ambulance handle a specific circumstance; perhaps one vehicle is sent ahead to determine the appropriate need. Many factors

are involved because fire service is changing all the time. He noted Mr. Camp, who was always involved with fire service, knew well how fire services evolved over time, and he was very familiar with the history of the Murray Department.

Ms. Turner stated Murray City's population was aging as well. Chief Rodriquez agreed needs were increasing due to elderly residents. In addition, the fire department enabled citizens to call for various situations. For instance, with a broken bone, instead of driving someone to a nearby hospital, citizens call 911 for all events, which has become the expectation citizens have nowadays.

Chief Rodriquez noted the third station was needed when the east area of Murray was annexed into the city. Station #84 is currently the Battalion Chief Station (BC), however, when the need for a fourth response station is determined, Station #84 will serve that purpose.

Mr. Brass wondered since the majority of calls were rescue and paramedic calls, would it be beneficial for the city to attain a medical oriented vehicle, instead of sending out fire trucks on every call. The chief agreed having the tower truck respond to unnecessary calls is costly. The idea was discussed frequently. In addition, he reported a common situation with the county when Murray paramedics are called to assist with alpha calls – they are not serious and most end up being transport calls. Over 1,000 calls of that nature were noted this year.

Because the department is busier than ever, many creative and different ways would be considered in the future to handle response - from what unit to send out, to the number of staff per vehicle. Within five years, the number of fire engines would remain the same, however, adding an additional ambulance at Station #81 would be necessary, due to medical calls increasing by 80%.

A power point was used to compare the design concepts of the new fire station #81 to the current station.

Related to the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and its location in the basement at Station #83, Mr. Brass wondered if the building was structurally sound in the event of an earthquake. He suggested relocating the EOC to the ground floor of the new Station #81, for easier access. Chief Rodriquez replied the EOC was placed at Station #83 in order to provide a station on the west side of the freeway. He suggested the new community training room could serve the EOC purpose, as well as, the option to relocate the EOC to the new city hall facility.

Mr. Brass stated his main concern was a solid location for back up servers, instead of having them all at one location, more importantly, he felt emergency servers should be moved out of the basement. Chief Rodriquez agreed. Mr. Tingey said the new fire station provided space for emergency servers.

Chief Rodriguez reviewed cost projections for construction, stating the lowest estimate was \$4.8 million and the highest was \$5.8 million. Both include contractor fees and an estimate for 5% annual contingency amount for the 21,961 square foot facility. It was noted that the contingency percentage should not be changed once the project started.

Conceptual drawings portray five bays including one longer and larger in size. The chief explained it was a common trend to accommodate large tandem fire engines. A tandem fire engine works best to access tight areas, therefore, should the city acquire one in the future the station would be prepared.

Chief Rodriguez reviewed the floor plan and noted a main entrance adjacent to Box Elder Street. Drawings depicted the location of: the lobby, reception area, administrative office, training and community rooms, fire prevention room, fire marshal and deputy fire marshal's offices, meeting rooms and restrooms, as well as, dining and deck area. Sleeping areas would increase from seven to 12 bedrooms, which are located on the second floor, along with living room, day room, kitchen and additional offices.

A video was shared to gain a complete overall vision of the facility, including window design, outside appearance, texture, as well as, landscaping and sidewalks.

The facility is considered "green" and meets LEED Silver certification requirements, which were included in cost estimates.

Mr. Tingey said from a timing perspective, the hope was to have complete property acquisition by now, however, issues during phase one of environmental testing, prompted a second phase of environmental tests, where lead and arsenic were found on the surface. An even bigger issue is the discovery of petroleum in ground water. Therefore, an Enforceable Written Assurance (EWA), application was submitted to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), which ensures the city would address these discoveries appropriately. After a 60 day review, the city can move forward. A request from the DEQ will require more boring into the southern part of the property, which is underway with Terracon Environmental Services. After tests are completed and challenges are resolved, the hope is to acquire the property.

Chief Rodriguez asked if contaminated discoveries were located on the fire department property. Mr. Tingey replied it was south of it. Questions remain as to where petroleum is coming from, because based on testing, there was never an underground tank located on the site. Additional boring would determine what direction to take and Mr. Tingey was confident the issue would be resolved, as well as, reducing the price to compensate for additional costs.

Mr. Brass noted as the property acquisition is finalized, there could be questions about the actual, physical location of the property line. Mr. Tingey agreed, there were discrepancies on the south boundary of the UTA property, which were resolved.

Mr. Harris asked if costs for environmental cleanup would be deducted from the price of the land. Mr. Tingey replied yes, reducing the price was discussed due to cleanup costs and a representative with UTA was present during conversations with the DEQ. He explained the design review process would continue, the property would be acquired, and the budget was already approved.

4. City Hall Development – Tim Tingey

Mr. Tingey shared a site map to explain original plans for the proposed location of the new city hall, which could be altered due to recent challenges. Conceptual drawings of the downtown area depicted completed property acquisitions. However, current concerns affect the grid system, traffic flow, and the relocation of a substantial gas line running through 5th Avenue connecting to the power department property.

Questions remain about moving forward to acquire the final properties, as well as, a final decision on the location for city hall. He stressed, as negotiations are underway with HKS Architects to secure a contract, the council's direction to make these decisions was imperative at this time. In addition, a construction manager, through Mocha Construction, would require a final contract. Therefore, Mr. Tingey asked if the original proposed location was still a favorable choice, and if not, he could offer optional choices.

Mr. Camp was not aware of any discussion otherwise to change the original preferred location.

Ms. Turner said yes, the new city hall would provide an anchor to the area, encouraging future development. She noted the opportunity to sell the current city hall property would help pay for the new city hall.

Mr. Brass liked the original location, opposed to other ideas, but felt if nothing else, city hall could be re-oriented to avoid straddling 5th Avenue. In addition, he asked if, it was really necessary to extend Hanauer Street clear to Vine Street. Maybe the idea was part of an outdated concept to provide a road, at a cost of millions of dollars, affecting only a small amount of State Street traffic.

Mr. Stokes felt without these extensions there was no other connectivity in the area to create the pedestrian experience. He explained the street 20 years from now, would be a one-way couplet, projected to carry approximately 10,000 to 12,000 cars per day into the downtown. It would not reduce traffic on State Street, however, it would provide pedestrian access, circulation, and offer an

alternative option to reach the area without using State Street. In addition, positive connections would be seen traveling in from the west, as well as, from Fireclay avoiding State Street. Looking at the big picture, from Hanauer to Auto Boulevard and Main Street, the city needs the extension. When considering the increased density, State Street cannot be the only focus for entering downtown. He heard the same argument - why not utilize Poplar Street because it already exists – but he understood the Poplar area was needed to accommodate increased density closer to State Street, allowing for much needed development.

Mr. Brass felt extending Hanauer cuts through what the city was trying to do and throws another road into a pedestrian oriented community.

Mr. Stokes noted the design of the road and the way it would be constructed would only enhance the pedestrian element, creating better connectivity to the area. He also felt that 5th Avenue would help with circulation, although, plans could be changed if necessary.

Mr. Brass wondered what the distance was between the outlet of Hanauer Street, and the entrance to Poplar Street. Mr. Stokes said it was approximately 300 to 400 feet. He explained Poplar Street would ultimately enclose with portions vacated becoming part of Poplar Park. Other sections would be included in the redevelopment. He imagined once Poplar was realigned with Hanauer Street, it would ultimately tie both to Main Street. By providing connectivity south to Vine Street, and Cottonwood Street, a new corridor would eventually be created through the city.

Mr. Camp said extending Hanauer Street south, would move a problematic intersection at Poplar and Vine Street, further west. Therefore, according to the proposed layout, he wondered if a new four way intersection created at 4th Avenue would remain long term, because it would not go anywhere. Mr. Stokes agreed, although short term, the street may feed into future developments to provide a connection along State Street development and existing properties in the area.

Mr. Tingey reviewed the process for moving forward by finalizing contracts with architects and construction management, reevaluating scenarios for city hall, as well as, other municipal buildings on the west side of State Street.

Mr. Nakamura reminded the council when considering the location of city hall, the city does not own the FOE property at this time, and therefore, they should not assume acquisition was definite.

Ms. Turner agreed the city does not own the property and wondered about other options. Mr. Tingey felt negotiations would continue because the FOE had been reasonable over the past few months and facilitating their new property was possible; although, he said Mr. Nakamura was

correct, the city may not acquire it. If the FOE could not secure the new location, working through other scenarios would prove helpful.

Mr. Brass noted a small lot to the north of 5th Avenue called the Strauser property. Mr. Tingey explained the property owner purchased the lot with plans to resell it, and, due to its size, development is prohibitive, unless the adjacent property was also purchased. In addition, a single family house remains vacant and in disrepair on the site, which has been a code enforcement issue for the city a number of years. Title issues and challenges related to the property losing its nonconforming status were mentioned. The hope is to negotiate with the owner eventually.

As for timing on the city hall, Mr. Tingey said property acquisition would continue, architectural renderings of the facility would be produced and brought forward, and subsequently review of optional locations would occur, as well as, for other municipal buildings west of State Street. After options are determined, public input would be obtained, and the city administration and council would provide further input.

Mr. Tingey noted a plan would be created to gather public input. Mr. Nicponski asked if other cities sought public input for public use development. Mr. Tingey was not aware of such public meetings. Ms. Turner felt as a city, Murray typically included the community in similar decisions. Mr. Camp believed the city should include public input.

Mr. Tingey said he appreciated the Library Board providing great input for the downtown development. Once conceptual renderings were ready, it would be easy to schedule open houses, form focus groups with city employees, local businesses, and the Business Enhancement Committee.

Mr. Brass commented he did not want to make the same mistakes Bountiful City made in relationship to building a new city hall. Ms. Turner stressed the importance of involving Murray citizens.

Mr. Tingey reviewed, once location options were identified, and public input was attained, construction costs estimates would be finalized - then bonding would take place. Mr. Tingey said bonding was appropriate once final construction drawings were completed and rough cost estimates were determined. The hope was to break ground next year, possibly mid to late summer of 2018 was noted.

5. State Street Bridge – Tim Tingey and Trae Stokes

Mr. Tingey reviewed the proposal for the State Street bridge to connect Intermountain Medical Center (IMC) on the west, to the current city hall site on the east, connecting on to the Front Runner and TRAX Station.

He reminded the council about an amenity bridge including a meandering pathway with benches and landscaping throughout. Various pictures displayed the amenity concepts as a place where people spend quality time and enjoy the experience of crossing. The idea was to create an iconic bridge as a unique element on State Street, rather than constructing a five or ten foot wide pedestrian type bridge.

Mr. Tingey noted two possible locations being considered and he related pressure from UTA wanting the city to choose quickly between options known as A and B, due to the timing of grant funding. He said UTA expected a choice five days ago. Mr. Tingey reviewed the options.

Bridge details had been reviewed by several staff members because significant challenges exist within both options.

Option A was located at the site of the liquor store on the west side of State Street across to the southern tip of the current city center property on the east side of State Street. On both sides this route was planned to connect with trails east and west. Major issues were involved with this option, however, as the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control had no plans to move their retail location on State Street.

A bridge at Option B would be located just south of the creek on the west and cross State Street into Murray Park on the east near the location of the carved statue.

After studying this option, Mr. Stokes reported three major concerns related to Option B. First, this was inside the smelter site boundaries and there was a likelihood of contaminated material at the location. Ground water issues related to driving piles for support of the iconic bridge was an additional concern. These factors were significant.

Second, the location of several large utilities, from east to west on both sides of the creek, as well as, utilities on the west side of State Street, running north and south, where two major storm drain lines are located. These details impact the location of the bridge, the footings and foundation to support it. He knew challenges could be resolved, but felt it unwise to make a decision without knowing the cost. He explained in order to reach over utility lines a larger bridge span would be required - a larger span meant higher costs. Estimates for Option A require a 150 foot span and Option B is more extensive requiring an estimated 250 feet. Mr. Stokes said moving utility lines in this particular area would be tricky but not impossible; it was the unknown cost for the entire process at this time that caused him concern but attaining the right vision for the city was equally important.

Third, Option B would block the frontage and visibility into the Murray Park entrance with height and distance requirements. He felt all challenges with Option B could be met, however, spending grant money on a much larger span, would not provide the width of the iconic bridge the city envisioned.

Mr. Tingey shared a fourth concern, the control of the bridge would be limited when utilizing grant funding. Mr. Tingey stressed a decision had to be made one way or another, on acceptance of the UTA Tiger Grant. Therefore, his recommendation was, with many unanswered questions and concerns, perhaps it might be wise not to pursue the Tiger Grant at this time. He explained other communities had backed out of the grant, therefore, it wouldn't be a major issue for the city to deny funding at this time. However, if the choice was to move forward with Option B – the result would be a basic pedestrian bridge.

Instead, the city could consider at a later date an amenity based bridge to connect the Transformation Center to future development on the east side. With input from IMC and the potential for interested donors, there could be the possibility of future funding. At that point the city could create the type of iconic bridge originally envisioned.

Mr. Camp felt there were too many unanswered questions, it was not what was originally envisioned, and the expense was concerning.

Ms. Turner, agreed and reminded the group of Option C, suggested by Mayor Eyre –not to build it right now.

Mr. Camp agreed with Mayor Eyre and Option C and all council members agreed. For now, the project would be delayed.

Mr. Tingey thanked the council for their direction and said the project was a possibility in the future. He added, with development unknown at the current city hall site, he understood why IMC would not financially commit to the project. When plans are more definite for development across the street from the Transformation Center, IMC indicated there was possible opportunity for financial interest.

6. Private Development Issues – Tim Tingey

Two private developments are in the works. One is the construction of an assisted living facility with other retail components; the appeal process is over and the decision of the planning commission was upheld by the hearing officer. Second, a more recent project, for senior living apartments with lower level commercial elements located at the indoor soccer property. A proposal would be coming

to the planning commission to modify the ordinance proposed by the applicant to allow 15% of the lower level be allowed for a leasing office.

The Utah State University project did not move forward, and the university decided to locate in another community with a 10 year lease.

There were no other specific private projects mentioned, but the city is still under an exclusive development agreement with JR Miller Enterprises.

Mr. Camp understood the project on Box Elder met zoning requirements, but he wondered about the change allowing the leasing office to be part of the commercial requirement. Mr. Tingey replied yes, plans would proceed through the public process and design review committee prior to council consideration.

7. Murray Theater, Murray Chapel and Murray Mansion - Tim Tingey

All three buildings are currently owned by Murray City or the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Tingey said when opportunities come to purchase historic buildings, many times the situation is opportunistic. For example, the Murray Theater owner contacted the city first - once ready to sell. The city acquired the property and is excited about its future use. It is currently being used as a practice facility for arts groups, which is working well. Parking is a concern for the venue, although city hall parking is currently available to accommodate visitors. Overall parking in the city was challenging and needed to be addressed. In order to assess what it will take to renovate the buildings, funding was approved to hire architects - quotes are expected back soon. With thoughts of attaining funding to help with renovations, he hoped one day it could be a venue for the Sundance Film Festival.

Mr. Camp wondered if easements were in place for exiting the Murray Theater property to the north or south. Mr. Tingey said there were none in those directions, but the situation would be addressed.

Ms. Turner favored utilizing the building for the city's local needs, as well as, renting it out for events such as the Sundance Film Festival. She felt purchasing the theater was a great decision never to be regretted.

Mr. Brass noted the stages at Hillcrest Junior High and Murray High School, as the beginning of an arts district with the potential of attracting various festivals, for example, the Shakespearean in Cedar City.

Mr. Tingey explained it was important to have a short-term presence in the Murray Mansion, the chapel and theater; therefore, short-term leasing for all of them might be an option once land use was established. Ms. Kirk and the History Advisory Board had expressed interest in moving the city's museum into the mansion. Mr. Tingey noted it was Mayor Eyre's desire, as well, and asked the council for their input.

Mr. Brass said the mansion was the most appropriate of all places for the museum. Ms. Turner, Mr. Hales and other council members agreed.

Funding is required to renovate the inside and outside of the Murray Chapel. Recently used as a reception center, the space would allow for community meetings in the future. Mr. Tingey said this idea was favored by Mayor Eyre, but he welcomed additional suggestions. Mr. Brass said the space would be nice for art shows. Ms. Turner commented the city could always use more meeting space.

Mr. Tingey said when cost assessments are determined for all three properties, the hope is to apply for funding at the state level during legislative sessions next year.

8. Future Parking Structures – Tim Tingey

Considerations need to be made for parking with the development of a new city hall and other buildings in the downtown on both east and west sides of State Street. The city committed to a parking structure with RDA funds when the expansion and extension of the Center Business District was approved.

Mr. Camp wondered if underground parking costs were prohibitive. Mr. Tingey said they could be, however, it would be nice to provide out of sight parking.

9. Open Space Planning – Tim Tingey

Mr. Tingey noted open spaces on a map including the development and extension of Hanauer Street, which would be part of the development of the city hall.

Ms. Turner said open spaces are very important to the area.

10. Adjournment: Ms. Turner adjourned the meeting at 2:40 p.m.

**Pattie Johnson
Council Office Administrator**