

Minutes of the Redevelopment Agency meeting held on Tuesday, July 18, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. in the Murray City Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Present:	Brett Hales	Mayor Ted Eyre
	Jim Brass	Janet Towers, Executive Assistant to the Mayor
	Blair Camp	Jan Lopez, Council Administrator
	Diane Turner	Tim Tingey, Executive Director
		Frank Nakamura, City Attorney
		Jennifer Kennedy, City Recorder

Excused: Dave Nicponski

Chairman Brett Hales conducted and opened the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Jim Brass made a motion to approve minutes from the meetings on February 21, 2017 and April 18, 2017. Seconded by Diane Turner.

A voice vote was made. Motion passed, 4-0.

UPDATE ON THE ORE SAMPLING MILL COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT AREA PROPOSAL

Tim Tingey stated that staff had the opportunity to meet with the school board about this proposal and they have directed their taxing entity committee (TEC) representatives to support the approval of the Ore Sampling Mill Community Reinvestment Area. Last week staff went before the state school board ad hoc committee that gives direction to their TEC representative. He said that the proposal did obtain their support although it wasn't unanimous, and it was unclear why there was an opposing vote because no explanation was provided. Staff has also discussed the proposal with the county and the next step is to discuss the proposal with their ad hoc committee, which includes both of their TEC representatives, prior to going before the county council to obtain direction. The challenge with the county is that they are opposed to moving through the TEC processes. Mr. Tingey explained that in the case of a Community Reinvestment Area with a blight determination, state law requires that we go before the TEC to evaluate the blight determination. It would be best if we could present the blight determination and have a vote on establishing the area in a single TEC meeting. County staff indicated that they were going to talk to Mayor McAdams about the issue because they prefer individual negotiations with taxing entities and entering into interlocal agreements rather than going through the TEC process. He said that if the county insists on interlocal agreements, it will delay establishment of this area because we will have to go back to the other taxing entities and negotiate with them individually.

Mr. Tingey stated that the development group wants us to move forward with establishing this area as urgently as possible. They haven't made a final decision about acquiring the property although they have done a lot of cleanup of the site. He stated that whether this proposal goes to the TEC or is completed through interlocal agreements, staff is proposing a ten percent housing set aside rather than the usual twenty percent, which is allowed under state code. The reason for this recommendation is that the area is quite small and the amount of funding that we anticipate collecting is not very much. Staff believes that we need every bit of tax increment to go towards environmental cleanup and getting the site prepared and ready to move forward with development.

Blair Camp asked if the decision rests solely with Mayor McAdams or the TEC representatives. Tim Tingey stated that the TEC representatives will obtain direction from both Mayor McAdams and the county council. They

have communicated their concern with going through the TEC process, so staff may have to go to the county council and explain the reasons why this proposal should go to TEC. Frank Nakamura said that the county council recommendation matters and that there may be an issue with the ten percent versus twenty percent set-aside for housing. Tim Tingey agreed and stated that the City is very supportive of the housing set-aside and has done a lot of good work with those funds. He said that if we have to increase to twenty percent it takes away from what we can pay for environmental remediation in this area. Staff is hoping to have as much funding as possible go towards cleanup and environmental remediation.

Diane Turner asked what the difference would be related to time for each of these processes. Mr. Tingey responded that if the proposal went to the TEC it is likely that we would be ready to hold a meeting in August for a final vote. Even if it is decided to proceed with interlocal agreements, the TEC would still have to meet to make the determination of blight and then staff would work on the interlocal agreement negotiations which would prolong the process by a few months. Frank Nakamura stated that it might take longer than a few months because we would have to negotiate each agreement separately. Diane Turner stated that hopefully the developer is patient throughout this process. Mr. Tingey said that the developer contacts him weekly to find out the status of the proposal and has communicated that a CRA must be established before they proceed with the project. Brett Hales asked how much the developer has spent to date. Tim Tingey replied that he doesn't have the exact amount but that they've provided cost estimates for the public improvements portion of the project which totals \$2.5 million.

CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT PROJECT AND PROPERTY ACQUISITION UPDATE

Tim Tingey displayed a map showing the properties that the City has been working to acquire for quite some time. He pointed out the parcels that are needed for the new road, including the parking lot area adjacent to Vine Street that is owned by the Day Law Office. Staff has been negotiating with them to buy a portion of their parking lot and then replacing the parking spots on an adjacent parcel that the City owns. The law office has responded favorably to the conversations and an appraisal has been ordered. The other property necessary for the future road is a drive access and parking area that is owned by the Fraternal Order of Eagles. A meeting is scheduled with the Eagles next month and staff will continue to work with them on the acquisition. He said that staff is still working on acquisition of the UTA site, which is the proposed location for a new fire station, and we have submitted all of the site environmental documentation to the state. There is a sixty day review period before the state provides a recommendation on what needs to happen for remediation of the site so that it can be developed. This is also the site that has been proposed for relocation of the Verizon cell tower. The remaining property to be acquired is the site where the Eagle's building is located and the Strasser property.

DISCUSSION AND REPORT ON THE PROPOSED STATE STREET PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE LOCATION

Tim Tingey stated that there was an open house a few weeks ago for the public to give input on possible locations for a pedestrian bridge across State Street. There were two options presented at that meeting. Option A is the furthest to the north and would locate where the liquor store is on the west side of State Street and connect to the site where City Hall sits currently. Option B would be located near the trail area and creek on the IHC property west of State Street and would connect closer to Murray Park. The City has received a TIGER grant for this project, which is part of a larger application, and has been advised that there needs to be a determination on where the bridge will be located in order to move forward with environmental review. He said that this item will be on the agenda for Committee of the Whole on August 1st for further discussion, and there are several concerns with both of the location options. Staff has met with state representatives of the liquor store and it is unlikely that we would be able to relocate that building within the time frame required for this grant, and there are also a lot of issues related to the location and cost of moving utilities. If the City chooses to move forward with a pedestrian bridge then a determination needs to be made on where it should be located.

Diane Turner asked if there has been any cooperation from the state to move the liquor store. Tim Tingey stated that in a recent meeting it was made clear that their priority is not the relocation of this particular store. There are multiple other stores that take priority, and they indicated that they would prefer to remodel the store at this site rather than move to a new location. Staff is going to have a conversation with Intermountain Healthcare representatives to see if there is an alternative site on their property to land the bridge. He stated that from an economic development and redevelopment perspective, locating the bridge north of the creek and connecting into the current City Hall site would be an iconic element and a great placemaking component of the downtown.

Blair Camp asked if there was a consensus that came from holding the open house, or if that will be discussed in more detail at Committee of the Whole. Tim Tingey responded that it will be discussed at Committee of the Whole, and although there wasn't a consensus the input seemed to be supportive of moving the bridge to the south where it would connect better from the hospital to Murray Park. However, understanding what will happen in the future with the current City Hall site has implications on the best location for a bridge.

Jim Brass stated that if you take into account the development on 53rd and State, then having the bridge a little further south aids those businesses because hospital employees can get across State Street to visit the restaurants. Tim Tingey stated that many of the long-term impacts depend on the amount of synergy we get with the downtown and future development. Considering the future and what we hope to do in the downtown area it makes sense to have it a little further north. However, not knowing what those impacts will be makes it hard to determine what would be the most effective location. He agreed that a bridge would create good synergy for the businesses on 5300 South.

Meeting adjourned.

B. Tim Tingey, Executive Director