



MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Murray City Municipal Council met on Tuesday, August 4 2020 for a meeting held electronically in accordance with the provisions of Utah Code 52-4-207(4), Open and Public Meeting Act, due to infectious disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus. Council Chair, Rosalba Dominguez, has determined that to protect the health and welfare of Murray citizens, an in-person City Council meeting, including attendance by the public and the City Council is not practical or prudent.

Considering the continued rise of COVID-19 case counts in Utah, meeting in an anchor location presents substantial risk to the health and safety of those in attendance because physical distancing measures may be difficult to maintain in the Murray City Council Chambers. The Center for Disease Control states that COVID-19 is easily spread from person to person between people who are in close contact with one another. The spread is through respiratory droplets when an infected person coughs, sneezes or talks and may be spread by people who are non-symptomatic. The intent is to safeguard the lives of Murray residents, business owners, employees and elected officials by meeting remotely through electronic means without an anchor location. The public may view the meeting via the live stream at www.murraycitylive.com or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>.

Citizen comments or public hearing comments may be submitted by sending an email in advance or during the meeting to city.council@murray.utah.gov. Comments are limited to less than three minutes, include your name and contact information, and they will be read into the record.

Council Members in Attendance:

Rosalba Dominguez - Chair	District #3
Diane Turner – Vice Chair	District #4
Kat Martinez	District #1
Dale Cox	District #2
Brett Hales	District #5

Others in Attendance:

Blair Camp	Mayor	Janet Lopez	City Council Director
Doug Hill	Chief Administrative Officer	Jennifer Kennedy	City Recorder
Jennifer Heaps	Chief Communications Officer	Pattie Johnson	City Council Office Admin.
Craig Burnett	Police Chief	G.L. Critchfield	City Attorney
Melinda Greenwood	CED Director	Brenda Moore	Finance Director
Jared Hall	CED Division Supervisor	Bryant Brown	Midvale City Council /Master Card
Justin Kimball	Kimball Investments	M.V. Ramana	Professor, University of British Columbia
Stephen Hopkins	Kimball Investments	Rusty Cannon	V.P. Utah Taxpayers Association
Bill Francis	The Imagination Company		

Ms. Dominguez called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 4:45 p.m.

Approval of Minutes – Ms. Dominguez asked for comments or a motion on the minutes from the Committee of the Whole meeting on May 19, 2020. Mr. Hales moved approval. Ms. Turner seconded the motion. (Approved 5-0)

Discussion Items:

Presentation related to the UAMPS (SMR) Small Modular Reactor – Ms. Turner spoke about significant financial matters associated with the upcoming decision the Council had to make, as to whether or not the City should remain involved in the UAMPS (Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems) SMR project. (SMRs are defined as small-scale nuclear reactors.) She reported so far, the City committed approximately \$330,000 with no out of pocket to the SMR project and up to this point there had been no public hearing; nevertheless, the City made these monetary commitments. She confirmed the Council received an extraordinary amount of information from UAMPS, only in support of the project; and very little else. She reminded Council Members about her personal concerns that she expressed over the last several months related to the lack of transparency, the cost of construction; and what the actual cost to power customers could be. Therefore, to gain further knowledge, she invited University of British Columbia, Professor, M.V. Ramana; and Rusty Cannon from the Utah Taxpayers Association, to discuss concerning issues she had. Ms. Turner gave the following introduction:

M.V. Ramana is a physicist and the Simons Chair in Disarmament, Global and Human Security and Director of the Liu Institute for Global Issues at the School of Public Policy and Global Affairs, University of British Columbia. He is the author of *The Power of Promise: Examining Nuclear Energy in India* (Penguin Books, 2012) and is a former member of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists' Science and Security Board*. Professor Ramana is a member of the International Panel on Fissile Materials, the International Nuclear Risk Assessment Group, and the team that produces the annual World Nuclear Industry Status Report. He is the recipient of a Guggenheim Fellowship and a Leo Szilard Award from the American Physical Society.

Professor Ramana discussed his work background; research and overall assessments and confirmed that for the last decade his focus has been mainly on the study of the SMR; including technical, economical and safety aspects, as well as, SMR marketability. A lengthy power point titled: *Modular Nuclear Reactors: Claims and Challenges* was given. He explained his views on nuclear power plants, outlined the history of SMR's and nuclear power; discussed cost increases; reviewed trends in the cost of alternative sources; and noted potential delays in project construction of the UAMPS/NuScale project as follows: (To view the presentation in its entirety, visit the City's website www.murray.utah.gov by clicking on the *Watch a Meeting* tab, Archives, Committee of the Whole August, 4, 2020.) (Attachment #1)

Professor Ramana made a basic point that small-scale reactors are not new because the world of nuclear power around the world, and in the United States began with building small reactors. For example, in the USA, there were 17 constructed in the 1950s and 1960s that technically qualified as small reactors; the definition of a small reactor is one that produces less than 300 megawatts of power. By comparison, he explained most nuclear reactors constructed today are designed to produce about 1000 megawatts of electricity. Since the 1960s, nuclear reactors were designed to produce more and more power, because most initial reactors do not perform well. Two failed power plants were highlighted:

- Wisconsin. Construction began in the late 1950's; finally connected to the grid in 1964, and shut down by 1968. After only four years the plant closed, due to problems when a major component failed that needed replacing. At that point, it was decided that for the small amount of electricity

the plant produced, it was not economical in cost to repair it. Construction costs increased over 250% of the initial estimate.

- Colorado, Fort St. Vrain. The generating station built in 1974 it had a similar fate. The design was first of its kind, new to the USA and known as the “World’s Safest” nuclear reactor; however, when in operation it only produced a fraction of what it was designed to generate. In addition, the resource was often shut down for repairs and other problems; final shut down was in 1988, and it was quoted as being ‘the plant that was rarely used.’

Professor Ramana has determined that all nuclear reactors look good on paper, but that does not mean they will operate sufficiently; there are unseen problems and kinks, not always apparent when looking at the design plans. He explained it was due to overall cost savings that the nuclear community initially moved away from SMRs, to begin building larger 1000-megawatt reactors, when it was realized that poor efficiency exists with SMRs. For example, he noted much of the neutrons produced inside the small reactor, was captured by the reactor itself, and escaped to the outside. This translates that the SMR requires more uranium to fuel the reactor for the same number of kilowatt hours of electricity that it generates; and, they produce more radioactive waste for each unit of electricity that is generated.

Professor Ramana suggested there is a notion in the nuclear community that although initial construction costs are high; costs will go down as more and more plants are built. As it turns out, this is not the case when looking at other countries like France, where costs have instead increased significantly. A graph was displayed to show rising costs in two countries that built the most nuclear plants; namely the USA and France. He said the reason is that every time a major accident occurs, like Fukushima, Chernobyl and Three-Mile Island, designers are required to put in additional safety features to ensure these accidents do not happen again. This adds to the overall cost of nuclear power plant construction. In addition, companies like NuScale would also say that learning comes after first plants are built; and costs lessen from past experiences, discovering errors, and improving inefficiencies. However, after quantitative analysis Professor Ramana observed this was not the case again, because more SMRs would need to be built, to become compatible with large reactors to meet production demands. Therefore, to compensate for the laws of economies of scale, hundreds, if not thousands of SMRs would need to be constructed; and it is not clear if there is a market for these kinds of reactors; nor, are there many communities willing to build the lost leaders that are the initial reactors of such significant cost.

He noted with the UAMPS project, one aspect to lower the cost is money contributed from the DOE (Department of Energy). However, even in the long run it is not expected for the small reactors to become economically comparable to even large reactors. He stressed even large reactors have not been economical in the last decade- in the USA; a number of them are shutting down.

Professor Ramana reviewed historical elements that in almost all nuclear plant designs and construction projects, what seems to occur is an evolution of cost- as the project goes from initial conception to actual completion. He provided results of a significant worldwide study to indicate that out of 180 nuclear projects, 175 of them exceeded budgets by 97%; with an average overrun cost of 117%. This means that original costs more than doubled in all 175 projects. Also, a time overrun of 64% occurred and projects took much longer than planned. He said this was not just a situation of older times but is occurring now with one of the latest projects in Georgia; construction began in 2003, which doubled to \$28 billion, and is still not complete. He thought there was no reason to think the UAMPS project would be any different, considering the same pattern of cost increases exists with NuScale. For example, when NuScale first proposed the CFPP design in 2015, the cost was expected to be much less than quoted today; from phase

to phase design costs have gone up, causing resource pricing to go even higher by 2020. He declared there were no clear details about how UAMPS calculated the current cost, so he questioned the actual cost; and when he reproduced their methodology he failed to come to the same conclusion. And, there was no understanding of how they came up with the \$55/MWh (per megawatt hour) cost, so he advised the Council to request more transparency prior to their decision making.

Professor Ramana noted other sources of electricity that have become cheaper; particularly solar and wind, which continue in a downward trend. He said this is mainly because stored solar is available after sunset and reduces the renewable to \$39/MWh; much less than SMR. Another argument is that SMRs can substitute as a backup to renewables when wind and solar are lacking. But Professor Ramana explained by utilizing the SMR for that reason only, results a 20% cost increase to the SMR resource, due to cost penalties that should be considered. He said you cannot have both- SMRs backing up wind and solar; and SMRs costing less, in terms of overall pricing.

A brief history of the CFPP was shared to confirm that from 2008 to 2020 the project already experienced many delays –including the submission of various applications. Professor Ramana expected more delays and said assuming everything goes well from here on out, generation would not even begin until 2029; this is much later than initial estimates for completion. He pointed out that the project has shown other problems; for example, issues with steam conversion and corrosion creating safety concerns. Also, an agreement issue was identified by the NRC (Nuclear Regulatory Commission) that caused challenges with the current investor, Fluor. So far, NuScale and the DOE have spent roughly \$1 billion on the development of the design; by his calculations another half billion is required before they are ready for design certification. He said it is unclear where that money will come from.

He summarized his final thoughts by reiterating the project will be more expensive than alternatives; it will be further delayed; cost estimates are doubtful; better transparency is needed for overall costs and timeframe of completion. All financial packages and subsidies involved are questionable, as well as, the method UAMPS is using to convey current cost estimates. With the long history of utility companies losing money on nuclear projects, for example in Washington State; and most recently Jacksonville, Florida, both are trying to pull out from nuclear projects, but are unable to.

Council Comments:

- Mr. Cox thought Professor Ramana shared solid theories, however, all the failed SMR examples given exposed 30-50-year-old technology. Mr. Cox understood nuclear technology has come a long long way since then. His biggest concern has always been about finding an alternative energy source when coal plants are permanently closed. He believed renewable energy was the way of the future, but the technology for storing great amounts of this type of energy is not perfected. He confirmed the City utilized wind and solar for intermittent power shortages; however, the urgency for finding something more constant to facilitate current gaps of generation during months of cloudiness, and significant lack of wind was imperative. He favored the SMR project because it would be reliable. And he expressed concern for Murray Power, and Murray residents not having access to efficient power, by depending on renewables only, that are not always reliable. He affirmed until renewables are able to push energy down transmission lines, and be productively stored, another resource must be found. He considered the CFPP as an investment, where there are caps, and off ramp opportunities the City can utilize, should the cost increase significantly. He stressed the matter of providing efficient energy to residents in the year 2040 and noted it is uncertain if technology for renewables would be made ready by then. He stated the CFPP is as carbon-free as it gets, and like

all types of energy producing resources, there are always manufacturing and environmental implementations involved; such as, natural gas, which omits carbon into the air, and requires fracking.

- Mr. Cox appreciated the informative presentation and said there was no perfect answer; he reiterated that soon coal would be gone, and the City had to find something to complement other resources in the City's portfolio.
- Professor Ramana responded that Mr. Cox made a good point; he agreed nuclear power should be considered low carbon; and there are concerns about the intermittency of renewables. However, to defend his view he noted improvements to the grid in recent years with larger shares up to 90%. In the last ten years, places like Denmark and Germany increased their number of renewables from the grid to 50%, so, he thought reliability was not a concern. He expressed no concern for lack of wind, because the grid has multiple sources of electricity generation collected within a great radius. He suggested ways to deal with intermittency as: not relying on just one source of renewable energy because wind power can be attained from offshore wind and other locations; and sun can be alternated with wind. At a cost, geographical connectivity would help fill in gaps, where energy being generated elsewhere can be transferred to other areas, shaping demand. He explained people would get accustomed to using power at different times of the day, by manipulating use, because not all demands are equally urgent. For example, like charging electric cars at certain times of the day and using appliances at other times of the day. This would manage the nature of demand and meet the generation supply. He said he didn't have a clear answer either, but noted the technology was shifting faster than the time frame the City could anticipate NuScale coming on line.

Mr. Cannon was introduced next, as Vice-President of the Utah Taxpayers Association since October 2018. He received a Degree in Finance from the University of Utah; and has over 20 years of experience in government relations, lobbying, financial services, sales and management. Mr. Cannon read comments that were similar to what he shared at an earlier press conference regarding the CFPP. He said:

- The Utah Taxpayers Association advised all cities and town councils that committed their municipal power rate payers to the UAMPS SMR project, to hold a public vote and withdraw from the project by September 14, 2020.
- While initially the project might have been found to work towards reliable cost effective long-term power, evidence and calculations were found by the Utah Taxpayers Association that provide a bleak picture of the massive high-risk financial commitments cities, including Murray will need to make long into the future.
- The proposal carries the likely potential for delays and enormous cost overruns on unproven technology that continues to be less and less cost competitive than other clean energy alternatives. Although information was difficult for them to gather, due to a quirk in Utah's open meetings laws, UAMPS is exempt from having to allow the public to view their meetings; findings were found as to why they think pulling out is the right decision for taxpayers, and rate payers:
 - Level of description. At a recent presentation during the last Bountiful City Council meeting it was noted that the project is only 30% subscribed.
 - The resource has only grown 1 megawatt out of 213 megawatt subscriptions in the last year, which is a good indication it is not selling well.
 - Investor owned utilities have turned down these types of projects for good reasons; confirmed by the level of subscriptions relative to coal, natural gas, solar, wind, and storage. SMRs are not cost competitive.
 - It is agreed with Professor Ramana that SMR nuclear projects have left many states, cities, municipalities, and power companies in financial ruin, to the tune of tens of billions of dollars.

- In the UAMPS situation, member cities together have dropped approximately \$9 million into the project; and according to the agreement cities must affirmatively vote to withdraw at several off-ramps – with the next off-ramp by September 14, 2020.
- After this, the next step constitutes approval for the design phase of the reactors, and acquiring a license, which is projected to cost UAMPS members approximately \$19.9 million more. At that point, city subscription levels would be calculated according to their shares; which means Murray's subscription level of 6.7286 percent, obligates the City to pay another \$1.341 million, if the next off-ramp is not taken.
- Money could be used for other city government functions, such as, police, fire, parks, streets, and other vital city operations. The situation is similar to another project the taxpayer association is opposed to, which is UTOPIA that obligates Murray to pay significant funds annually that could be otherwise used.
- Moreover, the risk only gets worse, as the approval section of the first phase is scheduled to take until approximately May of 2023; based on the current calendar, which has continually been delayed. At that time, the project would enter into the next phase, which is projected to last until November of 2025 – another two years. The UAMPS cost for members for that phase is an additional \$658.4 million. Meaning the next off-ramp would obligate Murray to approximately, \$44.3 million in commitments.
- In conclusion, he advised against gambling \$1.3 million right now, in hopes that things go well over three years, only to be committed to another \$44 million. For a city like Murray, it does not make sense.
- Construction is the last phase, which indicates costs will be staggering. This phase scheduled to begin in December of 2025 would currently cost UAMPS members over \$4.7 billion. In review, according to discovered documents, next off-ramp commitments for UAMPS members would be \$19.9 million, then \$658.4 million; and then over \$4.7 billion.

Mr. Cannon expressed overall disapproval for cities to commit that much money to a project that is still untested; and has not gained approval from the NRC; and relies very heavily on federal subsidies to the tune of billions of dollars. They believe it is a wrong move, and it will put rate payers, and taxpayers on the hook for massive sum costs for decades to come, and money spent already, pales in comparison to what cities would be committed to if the next off ramp is not taken. In conclusion, he urged all 27 city council municipalities in Utah that are subscribed to the CFPP to vote in public before September 14, 2020 to withdraw. He also stressed the importance of city residents to contact their city council members and urge the same.

Council Comments:

Ms. Turner stated with both presentations she was hopeful the council would realize the many red flags in moving forward with this project. She encouraged all to think carefully when the vote takes place, during a public hearing on September 1, 2020. She appreciated the council considering all the information.

Urban Wildlife Assistance Program – Chief Burnett announced that there is additional access to utilizing a wildlife assistance program now that Salt Lake County is handling Murray's animal services. Under the USDA (United States Department of Agriculture), and Division of Wildlife services, federal funding that was once in place before- was terminated five years ago; so, the Council of Governments worked to get the service back. Administered by the USDA, the program uses an outside agency to handle animals considered to be non-indigenous species, and urban pests that are nuisance animals; specific to raccoons and skunks. Chief Burnett confirmed the City has those issues often, so the program is something they wanted to consider adding to animal services this year. The hope is to monitor how much the program would be utilized before they continue it into the following year. All cities utilizing the wildlife program pay the County according to population, where professional trappers work with citizens to catch and eradicate pests in the best way possible. He noted the addendum is beyond the services approved in the recent contract with the County to oversee Murray's animal services; this is an annual cost of \$12,928.

Council Comments:

- Ms. Martinez asked what other cities participate in the wildlife program; and how city boundaries are addressed; for example, like neighboring Taylorsville. Chief Burnett said Taylorsville was working with West Valley City; but Salt Lake City, Midvale, Millcreek, Bluffdale, Draper, and all metro townships are participating with the County. He explained incidents would be handled similar to police work, where issues often cross back and forth between boundaries. Ms. Martinez asked if bats are included in the program. The Chief replied only raccoons and skunks; and if other concerns like rats, or bats arise citizens can be referred to other specialized services.
- Mr. Hales said the program would be good for the City. In the last two years, he received about 10 inquiries related to raccoons; so, he thought \$12,000 per year was well worth the service.
- Ms. Turner asked if a budget amendment was necessary to fund the program. Ms. Moore confirmed funding would be included in the upcoming budget roll-over; money from non-departmental - miscellaneous would be transferred to the police department budget to pay for this.

Van Winkle Crossing MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) – Ms. Greenwood discussed a proposed agreement between Murray City and Kimball Investments. She reminded the Council about their prior approval last year to amend the General Fund, and zone change affecting the area; commonly referred to as the K-mart-site on 900 East. After that zone change, Kimball Investments completed the planning commission process and received a conditional use permit through the mixed-use zone to develop the parcel. Part of the mixed-use zone requirement is to enter into a MOU with the City. Mr. Hall gave a presentation to describe the project, and review the purpose of the MOU, as follows:

- The site is 10.5 acres; 421 units; multi-family housing, and commercial space of 21,000. Interior roadways will be throughout; with the access road to the Millcreek neighborhood remaining open.
- The horizontal mixed-use project would be a test to house residential space, and commercial businesses- unlike vertical mixed-use zones, as seen in TOD (transit orient districts) areas.
- The MOU will provide control of the phasing of development to ensure commercial spaces are constructed that relate well to the rest of residential portions. The City would request a master site plan, which is controlled by the MOU. Since the planning commission is not empowered to approve an MOU, which is similar to a development agreement, the City Council is the governing body who would consider its approval.
- Developers must agree to several key elements that the MOU establishes and controls, for example:
 - The composition of the development; by stipulating size, number of units; and how much space will be retail, and how that happens in phases.
 - Phase One: Residential units are built; and construction implementation of infrastructure along 900 East. Utility infrastructure would be fabricated to serve the 21,000 square feet of commercial space to create a functioning vibrant place for residents to live and shop at.
 - Phase Two: Remaining residential complexes will be constructed.
 - Phase Three: The commercial phase, which is independent of the first two phases of residential.
 - Time limits on all components: From the date of MOU approval, a shot clock of five years begins for all commercial spaces to be built; the time limit for residential permits is two years. Mr. Hall said when considering the existing traffic flow on 900 East, the MOU ensures the ability for the commercial front components to be completed in a timely manner.
 - Access from the Millcreek neighborhood east to 900 East. The road will benefit, what Mr. Hall refers to as “Murr creek” residents who have had access in and out for a very long time. Developers must allow a road provided with sidewalks to enjoy nearby shopping.
 - Implementation of improvements to the site plan. A central feature is required providing room for food trucks, temporary stages for gatherings and events that tie in with the restaurant area on the northeast corner consistent with various paving.
 - Methods for terminating the agreement. Should planning not go as agreed, the City may stop the issuance of permits, and additional permits- if terms are not being met as the project proceeds.

Mr. Hall shared that City staff was pleased with how the project turned out; and reiterated that the MOU controls the site plan, to ensure all development and construction is bound to site plan improvements already approved by the planning commission. He displayed conceptual drawings that represented the mixed-use commercial and housing project, with multifamily units; the majority being single and two bedroom, with fewer three-bedroom units. A copy of the MOU document was shown.

He said it was a challenging planning commission meeting when the public hearing was held on December 5, 2020, although the vote to move forward with approval of the site plan was 7-0. The lengthy meeting allowed for many comments and questions, but in the end an urban-type quality mixed use project will be developed. Staff recommended to the Council that they also approve the MOU for the Van Winkle Crossing mixed use development during the council meeting.

Council Comments:

- Mr. Cox commended having the access road to 900 East from the Murrcreek neighborhood, which was a key piece in his favoring the project. Mr. Hall agreed that access was important.
- Ms. Turner thought the project would be a real boom for the City; she asked when construction would start. Mr. Hall said estimated construction would be seen in a couple of years, and developers are anxious to have the MOU in place, as to attain permits for the first phase of residential construction, and commercial utility infrastructure.
- Ms. Martinez asked if any of the residential components were designated as affordable housing. Mr. Hall noted other affordable housing projects were coming up; but this was not one of them. It was his understanding during the entitlement phase that units would all be market rate. Ms. Martinez noted citizen concerns about the project being four stories high; she asked if buildings would be the tallest in the area and was height comparable to the area. Mr. Hall confirmed three-story buildings, apartments and condominiums are situated to the north and east; four-story buildings will be closer to Millcreek; and the five-story podium buildings would be the tallest in the area. He pointed out buildings would not be strikingly taller from a distance, due the 10 ½ acre site that provides distance to buffer such a mass.
- Ms. Dominguez discussed concerning public comments related to safety and security in the Millcreek neighborhood, and at the site during construction. Mr. Hall recalled such public comments at the planning commission meeting that stemmed from years of people loitering at the empty site, as well as, homeless camps behind K-mart. He confirmed the access road was in place precisely for first responders like police and fire to get into the isolated neighborhood and construction area in the best way. He thought nefarious activity would lessen quickly with construction.
- Ms. Dominguez wondered if construction plans were officially approved; if additional changes were possible; how many parking stalls would accommodate residents; if sewer lines would overwhelm the neighborhood and was the access road wide enough to handle traffic in and out of the area. Mr. Hall said major changes like adding more units and increased parking would require another planning commission meeting; and only small changes can be made to the site plan. There are 718 parking spaces on site; including inside structured parking, podium stalls, street parking, as well as, intermittent parking shared between retail and residential buildings. He believed there would no parking issues at this site. Sewer services would come from Olympus Sewer, who indicated they could handle the 421 units and the additional commercial businesses. Old problem lines in the area would be improved and upgraded; so new lines and upgrades would make the system work very efficiently. Mr. Hall addressed public comments about increased traffic cutting through the Murrcreek neighborhood to access 900 East. But, blocking the road was not an option from a public safety, and planning and engineering standpoint; the road better connects the entire area. He said traffic flowing through the area would be slow, because it

is not a straight though road, and Google maps refuses to map it out because it is intertwined through the neighborhood making it hard to cut through quickly. He did not think traffic would be an issue, and the road would be used only by resident's familiar with it. The CED would return to the council meeting on August 25, 2020 to seek approval of the MOU.

Mr. Kimball, with Kimball Investments brought more clarity to building height questions to make sure the Council understood fully. The decision to situate buildings from east to west, according to height was to disperse varied heights, because taller structures would be six stories; five-story buildings are constructed above podium parking structures.

City Business News – Ms. Martinez who serves on the Murray Economic Task Force with Midvale City, Council Member Bryant Brown, highlighted the Murray business where Mr. Brown is employed. Mr. Brown informed the Council his employer Finicity was recently acquired by MasterCard for \$825 million; with incentives up to one billion dollars. Pending government approval, it was a top ten sale in the State of Utah. Headquartered in Murray, located at the Center 53 Office Complex, they have 500 employees and continue to hire with competitive pay for positions in computer engineering and data science. He stated they are excited to be part of the Murray community and to show their commitment to the area, the lease was renewed, and they plan to double their building size to become a major footprint in Murray.

Council Comments:

- Mr. Hales appreciated the great news and welcomed their growth.
- Ms. Turner wondered how big office expansion would be; and asked how soon before the pending purchase would come to fruition. Mr. Brown said the government waiting period was anywhere from ten days to one year. He reported the product was selling itself well, so office expansion was already underway to accommodate the hiring of up to 30 more people with advanced degrees in computer engineering. He added that only 15 employees are currently working in the office, due to COVID-19, and others would continue to work from home to observe COVID safety guidelines.

Announcements: None.

Adjournment: 6:11 p.m.

Pattie Johnson
Council Office Administrator II