

The Redevelopment Agency (RDA) of Murray City met on Tuesday, January 19, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. for a meeting held electronically in accordance with Utah Code 52-4-207(4), due to infectious disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus. The RDA Board Chair has determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location because physical distancing measures may be difficult to maintain in the Murray City Council Chambers.

Any member of public may view the meeting via the live stream at www.murraycitylive.com or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>. *If you would like to make public comments during the meeting please register at: <https://tinyurl.com/y2zpucq7> OR you may submit comments via email at: rda@murray.utah.gov. Comments are limited to 3 minutes or less, and written comments will be read into the meeting record.

RDA Board Members

Dale Cox, Chair
Brett Hales, Vice Chair
Director Kat Martinez
Rosalba Dominguez
Diane Turner

Others in Attendance

Blair Camp, RDA Executive Director
Melinda Greenwood, RDA Deputy Executive
Janet Lopez, City Council Executive Director
Jennifer Kennedy, City Recorder
Jennifer Heaps, Chief Communications Officer
G.L. Critchfield, City Attorney
Brenda Moore, Finance & Admin. Director
Jared Hall, Planning Division Supervisor
Jay Baughman, Economic Development
Specialist Citizens

Mr. Cox called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of the December 8, 2020 and January 5, 2021 RDA meeting minutes

MOTION: Ms. Turner moved to approve the minutes from December 8, 2020 and January 5, 2021 RDA meetings. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Martinez.

Ms. Martinez Aye
Mr. Cox Aye
Ms. Dominguez Aye
Ms. Turner Aye
Mr. Hales Aye

Motion Passed 5-0

Citizen Comments

Kate Sturgeon – Murray City, Utah (Email)

Dear Mayor Camp, City Council, Redevelopment Agency, Mr. Hall, Ms. Lopez, Ms Greenwood (and others mentioned within, but I was unable to find an email address for whomever makes traffic

decisions for the city)

This is a long list, with multiple areas of concern, but these are the things on my neighbors' and my minds regarding the city's move forward with recent planning options/decisions.

My true angst is seeing what former Murray mayor Dan Snarr's vision for Murray (becoming "just like every other city between Salt Lake and Provo") coming to fruition. Our taxes, utility rates, crime rates are all rising. Services are not keeping pace with increased demand, and now "Mixed Use" zoning is being considered in places where it shouldn't. Jared Hall of the Zoning Dept got down to basics for mixed-use: money or as he said, "better reward with mixed-use than with individual homes or small businesses." The charm of what used to be Murray is rapidly disappearing with new, replacement projects.

Murray has the advantage of being in the heart of the valley, with some of the last large parcels of (re)developable land. No one is making any MORE land. As the real estate axiom goes, it's location, location, location. Gone (or should be gone) are the days of Murray's inferiority complex of accepting any old proposal from the first taker. When I moved here in 1990, a mayoral candidate was dancing/ecstatic that "the last parcel in Murray's been sold." Because back then, Murray wasn't the place to be and you couldn't give it away. Fast forward 30 years, and you, as city leaders, managers and the ones who shape the future of our city, have the unique opportunity to make this redevelopment into something to be proud of, and not just another identical, cookie cutter suburb with uninspired/cloned architecture.

Where is a welcoming entrance to Murray? Certainly not State Street. Not Vine Street (which after the recent redo from 900 E > 1300 E is just a heat absorbing/then reflecting, treeless multilane mess). Heading in from the industrialized west, not there either. 900 E isn't particularly pretty, until one reaches 5900 S > Winchester, the very area mixed-use is being considered, where new businesses and Wheeler Farm are. Winchester itself is a five lane speedway, with its own set of issues.

Trees are the cheapest and easiest way to improve aesthetics as well as help cool a city. It seems the design trend of late is to butt projects up to the sidewalk, therefore increasing heat absorbing surfaces with no return benefit (ie., harnessing all that solar power for positive return), and thus negating any possibility for a shady spot. Examples: the corner of Vine and State, with the hotels (mixed-use zoning); the new project at Winchester/520 E.; the proposed new mixed use building being considered for 4800 S & State Street (at least according to the illustrations provided in the project proposal). Residents exiting the subdivision behind the new construction at 520 E/Winchester have obscured vision of oncoming traffic, as a result of 7' walls abutting the sidewalk. Whoever approved the sight lines needs to review reality and not wishful thinking. It may meet established guidelines, but no one goes the speed limit (or under) on Winchester. Murray Police Department could make bank issuing speeding citations there. I ask for better coordination between the planning department and traffic study group, to go onsite to witness reality and not go by what a book says should work. And, in searching Murray's website for emails, I was surprised to learn Murray has a "Shade Tree and Beautification Commission. Why are they not involved in planning decisions? They seem rather neutered at present.

One would think the tree lesson was learned when Fashion Place Mall took out all its mature trees to xeriscape (?). Previously, the walk around there was almost pleasant, but no longer. One must use their car to access the shopping center across the street, or move anywhere in that area. Local residents are also ripping out their mature trees. I think we will learn a sad lesson as the summers heat up more and more, and there is less and less respite from the relentless sun.

Walkability in Murray overall has suffered as well, but specifically, (pre-covid) children in the James Point Apts cross Winchester (a five lane freeway) to get to their elementary school. Not all children head to the 725 E stoplight. Just as cars don't always adhere to speed limits, children don't always take the 'approved' route. The UDOT's blinking light straddling 900 E. at Wheeler Farm is just as dangerous, because the pedestrian can't see when the lights are flashing, thereby safe to cross. A simple walk light coordinated with the flashing lights would mitigate that. Longview Elementary children use that space to cross 900 E. for their Wheeler Farm field trips.

Putting mixed-use zoning at the corner of 900 E & Winchester doesn't make sense. It doesn't fit with the current aesthetic of Murray and the established residential neighborhood surrounding this plat. The corner of 900 E and Winchester is not Ft Union, yet. Please don't turn it into that. Logic would say that it makes far more sense to continue in the vein of the offices which line 900 E from 5900 S to Winchester, on the west side. They're attractive and should be producing tax revenue for the city. It also keeps in line the quasi residential look that "up to 360 units" mixed-use zoning can't. Correct the error which was made 50+ years ago, when RC Willey was permitted to locate its building there. One error needn't be replaced by another.

Mixed-use makes far more sense in the sea of asphalt between 5900 S – 6100 S and State Street, which is the Shopko pad, the old Toys R Us pad, or Van Winkle & 5600 S. It makes far more sense to happen in those locales, where restaurants & ground floor businesses would be welcome; green space could replace heat-absorbing asphalt. Murray has lots of those kinds of eyesores which would make far more sense to change zoning to mixed-use, than sticking one in an established residential area.

In looking at the plans for the 4800 S/State Street development, and reading the proposal submitted by the architectural firm, it states that the "minimum parking requirements have been met." So, before the cement has cured, there will already be overflow parking issues. This project uses today's standards, and since this building will have a shelf life of 30-50 years, parking will be grossly inadequate for decades to come. We are currently dealing with the effects of poor parking planning with the lawyer bldg. at the corner of 725 E/Winchester. Cars from that complex spill out onto 725 E and are not contained within the business' lot. That building/complex is only a few years old, and we already have serious issues there. And that they threaten to sue the city when asked to do something indicates a serious error was made. Can we please learn from it?

Murray's website is chronically out of date: there's nothing of substance on Murray's website re the Fashion Place West Small Area Plan. If one wants to become educated on the happenings in Murray City's government, isn't its website the first stop for its citizens to educate themselves re projects being considered? Informing a wider area than only those within a 300' or 500' adjacent perimeter of actions under city consideration would be incredibly helpful as well. This current 300-500' notice limits Murray citizen engagement regarding the future of their city.

Thank you for letting me air some issues which have been building (no pun intended!) of late. Granted, covid hasn't helped. (When discussing some of the above with a neighbor, he asked "where are they meeting so I can go", not having a clue that meetings have been held online for months.) But also not helping is Murray City making these decades-long-impacting decisions without the input of its citizens, simply because said citizens didn't know they were under consideration. Good communication is essential in every walk of life, and none more so than local government with its citizens.

Alex Teemsma – Murray City, Utah (Spoken and Email)

My name is Alexander Teemsma. I live at 10 W Miller Street, Murray, UT, District One. What up, Redevelopment Agency people! Hope you all are doing well and thank you for the work you are doing. I just want to share a few thoughts regarding the proposed Gerding Edlen development in the Murray City Center District (MCCD):

I tried to do a little research on Gerding Edlen. Their website is not working for me right now; however, I was able to look into their Brewery Blocks development in Portland. Apologies if I'm sharing information you already know.

Gerding Edlen did an absolutely awesome job with the First Regiment Armory Annex, which is now Portland Center Stage at The Armory. Wikipedia says "The Armory has become a significant case study for historic preservation and sustainable design." I have confidence that Gerding Edlen can do the same in Murray City, striking a balance between innovative, sustainable development while highlighting the beauty of nearby, historically significant properties.

That being said, the concern I would like to share is how the proposed development in the MCCD, aside from aesthetics, will affect the character of the downtown and Murray as a whole. As I understand it, Gerding Edlen will decide what businesses will occupy the retail and dining fronts.

The Brewery Blocks website shows that there are 27 retail/dining spaces shared between the 5 blocks (<http://www.breweryblocks.com/retailers/>). Of the 27 retail/dining spaces at The Brewery Blocks, 2 are unoccupied and 20 are national brands (e.g., The North Face, Lululemon, Starbucks, Sur La Table, etc.). The remaining 5, per my count, include: the theatre; Frame Central, a framing store with seven locations limited to the Pacific Northwest; two restaurants; and Rachelle M., a fashion specialty store with three locations throughout Oregon. So more than 80% of the retail fronts are leased to large businesses with no specific ties to Portland or even Oregon.

While the selection of stores may have been influenced by the fact that Portland is a larger city, larger than Murray City anyway, it would seem Gerding Edlen could do more to prioritize leasing to locally-owned restaurants and stores. Or maybe smaller businesses wouldn't be able to afford the leases. Regardless, the selection process of lessees for the future development in Downtown Murray is something that ought to be re-evaluated. The types of businesses that fill those spaces will have long-lasting implications for the character of Downtown Murray. I look at Downtown Provo as an inspiration for the things Murray could do, and of the 133 retail and dining options listed on their website, I could count on one hand the number of national brands (<https://www.downtownprovo.com/maps/>). Murray has plenty of big box store and national brand/chain representation throughout the city and at Fashion Place Mall.

I am unsure of the legality of influencing the selection of lessees, but maybe a provision can be made in the MCCD guidelines or the deal with Gerding Edlen can be negotiated to include specific requirements for retail and dining space lessees (i.e., approval from the RDA).

Janice Strobell – Murray City, Utah

Ms. Strobell said she supports the comments made by Alex in regard to local vs. national businesses in Murray. She wishes to commend the Board as they bring the city into the future and their desire to listen to individuals in their decision making. She asked that the Board consider the following questions as they work on the 4800 South and State Street development:

How is this project enhancing diversity and building on what makes Murray one of a kind?

Does this project promote diversity in both population and business?

How does this project support and encourage local “mom & pop” and startup businesses to come to downtown Murray?

Does this project harmonize with the surrounding built environment that has been the mark of arriving in Murray?

Will such a development enhance or detract from Murray’s charm?

She trusts that the Board will honor what has made Murray today and build upon that identity as we build a bright future.

Joseph Silverzweig – Board Member, Murray Area Chamber of Commerce
Dear Board,

The Murray Area Chamber of Commerce is excited to see our local government’s continued investment into the economic development of Murray’s downtown. This part of our city has the potential to be a humming engine of commerce and the plans put forward by the contractor the board has selected look like a great balance of uses that will make it a destination for residents and businesses alike.

As the process moves from the conceptual to the practical phases, the Chamber is hopeful that the business community, along with local residents, will be an active participant in the development discussion. We are confident that our insight into Murray’s economy will help make the project as engaging and productive part of our community as possible.

Workshop Presentation and Discussion – Presenter: Melinda Greenwood

Ms. Greenwood presented information regarding the history of the Central Business District redevelopment area. It was formed in 1979 for a 32-year period. It triggered in 1983 and was to expire in 2014, but it was renewed in 2010 for an additional 20 years. The new expiration year is 2034. The project will have been in existence for 54 years by the time it finally expires.

The M CCD zone allowed unlimited height for buildings, but in 2018 it was changed to 135’. In early 2019, Ms. Greenwood sent out a survey asking RDA Board about their most important elements of the M CCD. They held a workshop in the spring to go into more depth about the survey results and the direction that they could go for development to take place. Based on this discussion, the department moved forward with an ordinance revision to be adopted by the Council. The intent was to simplify the process and ordinance and to modify the historical preservation provisions. The Design Review Committee was retained as part of this ordinance and adopted recommendations by staff. In 2020, the City was able to use these changes when it issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the development of the RDA’s property at 48th Street and State Street.

The RDA Board reviewed the draft of the RFP and staff received comments about it. Staff responded to the Board’s comments prior to issuing the RFP. The RFP was opened on April 6, 2020 and closed on July 10, 2020. Communication with interested parties was conducted through the state’s procurement website to ensure the integrity of the RFP and so that questions and answers were available to all interested parties. Ms. Greenwood sent the RFP to approximately 100 different developers and groups.

Ms. Dominguez asked how many of those developers were out of state. Ms. Greenwood stated that that

number was a mix of in-state and out of state developers. Most were local, however. The state's procurement website reached many developers that she did not know about. She tried to contact developers who were local or who have done work in Utah in the past.

Ms. Greenwood explained The RDA received five proposals that were deemed responsive, meaning that they successfully met the requirements that the RFP had in place. With guidance from the city's legal counsel and procurement staff, a review committee was formed and scoring criteria was finalized. The committee reviewed proposals using scoring sheets and created a short-list for in-person discussions. The two short-listed firms were interviewed in September. The entire committee agreed upon the top firm to forward to the Board for their review. At the November 19, 2020 RDA meeting the Board voted 3-2 to enter into exclusive discussions with the Edlen Company, LLC (Edlen). The proposal was submitted under the name of Gerding-Edlin, but the company's name changed following the proposal submission and our discussions with them.

Ms. Greenwood went over some of the comments from the RDA Board as they discussed the exclusive negotiations and some of the questions raised from Edlen's presentation at the November 19th meeting. First was the MCCD Ordinance and what aspects it controls versus what aspects of the project will be controlled by market considerations. MCCD governs density and the number of units per acres as well as maximum building height. Public improvements such as open space and sidewalks is regulated by the MCCD ordinance. Parking is regulated by the MCCD as is allowed uses, design factors (to a limited extent, such as building scale and materials), and the process. Market and financial decisions or factors dictate density as well. The developer will make decisions on height or number of units per acre based on their financials. If what they desire is against the MCCD ordinance, we will tell them it is not allowed. They will need to reconfigure their design or financials for the project to move ahead. If the developer proposes height or density levels that conform to the ordinance, then we need to allow it. Height restrictions are based on the overall height of the area. In November, the topic of owned versus rental units was a point of discussion, and this is something that is driven by the market. Ms. Greenwood recommended that the Board not get involved in such matters unless they are prepared for impacts to how it would affect the developer's business model. Commercial space tenancy is dictated by the uses of the zone, spelled out in the MCCD. We can indicate what we would like, but the developer and market forces will have the ultimate say in what goes in there. The design of the development is not something that we can dictate to the developer. Ms. Dominguez asked if Ms. Greenwood could explain what is already in the MCCD design review guide. Ms. Greenwood said that would be answered at a different part later in the presentation.

The MCCD process as approved is what dictates the process, so it is what the RDA and city anticipates following. Some of the comments from the November meeting revolved around a public input/comment process. That is something the Edlen is willing to do but it is not required by the ordinance. All projects in the MCCD go before the Design Review Committee and the Planning Commission. These meetings are publicly noticed and at the Planning Commission there is an opportunity for the public to comment.

Ms. Greenwood then transitioned the meeting to Mr. Hall to go over the rest of the MCCD process. Every project in the MCCD zone goes through a pre-application conference where the developer spends time with CED staff, and perhaps other city staff, talking through the application before it is fully formed and getting some direction and feedback on the design standards and whatever else might be needed for a full application. The Design Review Application used to be known as the Certificate of Appropriateness, but the terminology was changed in November of 2019. This step in the review process also involves city staff such as Engineering, Fire, Building, etc., who did not weigh in at other

times during the pre-application process so that they can give feedback. The application is then ready to go before the Design Review Committee (DRC) which, as mentioned before, is a public meeting. The meeting is more informal and has been known to take public comments even though the meeting guidelines do not require it. The DRC will review the project and forward the project to the Planning Commission with a recommendation, though often times the project may be referred back to the DRC with suggested changes. The DRC is a recommending body only and does not make approvals. After the DRC has forwarded the project with a recommendation for a project to the Planning Commission for a public hearing which is noticed to the public including neighboring property owners the distance of which is determined by the size of the project. Public comments are received at the Planning Commission meetings and the Commission will make a decision. There is a Standard of Review that has been adopted by the Planning Commission for reviewing projects in the MCCD to ensure that the project conforms with the various plans (such as General Plan) that the city has in that area. The MCCD guidelines will be consulted during their review as well, citing the statement "The guidelines shall be consulted during the review of the proposed development in order to provide guidance, direction and options which will further the stated purposes of the MCCD. Wherever practicable, developments should adhere to the objectives and principles contained in the Design Guidelines." Ms. Turner asked for clarification of what "practicable" meant. Mr. Hall explained that it means that a project should not be thrown out because it does not meet every single "checkbox" or requirement in the 50 pages of the guidelines. Ms. Dominguez pointed out that the above statement that Mr. Hall read was not in the MCCD guidelines and asked if it was in a new version. Mr. Hall explained that the statement comes from the city code, title 17, which references the MCCD Zone. Ms. Greenwood explained some of the changes between the MCCD guidelines before and after the November 2019 meeting. Ms. Turner commented on how the term "practicable" could be interpreted loosely and that it could introduce changes. Mr. Hall used the new City Hall development as an example of how a project was able to be approved due to the flexibility of the MCCD design guidelines, where holding certain rules in place made no sense for aspects of that particular project. Ms. Greenwood explained further how the DRC has the ability to ensure that design elements are being met while being flexible at the same time. Mr. Cox stated that we needed to have opportunities for public comment on the project, and the earlier the better, because it may affect the design of the project. Ms. Greenwood stated that Edlen Company is open to having public engagement opportunities and they have discussed having a process once the site plan has been reviewed and a more refined concept has been finalized. Edlen is experienced in public outreach and could engage with the public themselves.

Ms. Greenwood asked Mr. Hall to clarify design guidelines versus development standards. Murray City has elected to have the design standards in the City ordinance.

Ms. Greenwood then shifted the topic to parking and some of the current issues regarding parking in the city. Current agreements that city staff create with developers are negotiated with provisions for the construction of a parking structure, if necessary, at the start of the project or in the first phase. Approximately 12 years ago, when the development agreement was negotiated with Fireclay Investment Partners, the parking structure was included in the third phase. The construction of the structure was contingent upon the developer obtaining property that they could not ensure they would be able to purchase. The developer did not acquire the property and walked away from the project, leading to a situation where needed parking spaces were never provided and contributing to the current lack of parking in the area. The city has learned a lesson from this and would not propose a similar agreement to the RDA Board again. Mr. Hall went over parking requirements as required by city code. He reiterated the need to have parking structures built up front at the start of a project because of their expense. Developers are not allowed to count on-street parking as part of their mandatory parking

requirements. Executive Director Camp clarified that on-street parking was allowed by the code but changed to disallow it around 2015 or 2016. Ms. Dominguez asked how other cities handle parking issues. Mr. Hall said that development agreements are commonly used by other cities when mixed use developments are negotiated. Murray City handles these issues through agreements in much the same way. Ms. Greenwood said that she has received some additional information regarding the Fireclay Area parking approvals and that she would send that information to the RDA Board. It provides information about the third phase that never happened and the number of parking spots that were never provided.

Ms. Greenwood transitioned the discussion to the Edlen project at 48th and State Street. Edlen has provided a tentative timeline for the project with the approval process being completed in winter of 2021 and construction starting in the spring of 2022 and the development opening in the spring of 2024.

Mr. Cox stated that he is impressed with the developer and stated once again that he encourages public input on the project. Ms. Turner said that she wanted to involve the citizens in the project as soon as possible. She also was wondering if there was a way to work diversity into the types of living units in the project. Ms. Greenwood responded that the developer will do a market study to determine what types of units will rent the best. We can try to have a dialogue about our desires, but the developer will likely go based on market forces. Ms. Turner expressed concerns about what she believes will be higher-income units in the project. Mr. Cox asked Ms. Greenwood to ask Edlen about the make-up of housing units in the project. Ms. Greenwood asked for clarity on what “diversity” meant in regard to the make up of housing units, asking if she was referring to size of units or income levels of residents. Ms. Turner agreed that she meant income levels as well as the make up of owned vs. rental units. She would like to see a mix housing types rather than just having it all be expensive apartments that are going to end up requiring several people to afford them. Ms. Greenwood said that she can express those concerns and preferences to the developer. Mr. Hales expressed his belief that Edlen would be on board with those ideas. Ms. Greenwood agreed that they would likely be sensitive to the concerns that are expressed but that they are also very experienced in projects such as this and may find that what the public prefers or desires is not always able to be included for various reasons. She clarified that during the procurement process, 259 vendors were notified of the project through the state’s procurement website. Ms. Turner expressed that the idea that decisions for the project are solely market driven grates on her because this project is where we are taking the city.

Ms. Martinez agreed that bringing the public in is desirable and would like to be able to communicate to the citizens why we are taking the project in a certain direction. The process can sometimes be confusing even for individuals on the inside. She also wondered when the project will be coming before the RDA Board for a decision or vote. Ms. Greenwood stated that one of the reasons that the committee chose Edlen over the other firm being considered is because Edlen did not ask for any public funds such as tax increment financing. If the city imposes its desires to have aspects of the project such as diversity and affordable housing, Edlen would come back to the RDA Board and ask for funding to make up the difference. Traditionally, TIF funds are used for projects that would not happen if it were not for public funds. The RDA has collected the parcels of land that the project will sit on, a task that a private developer would not pursue. If the Board desires items that do not make sense for the market, then the Board needs to be willing to subsidize or provide an incentive for the developer. The city will follow the MCCD guidelines and so the next step would be for Edlen to engage with the public. There are several items for the RDA Board to consider and those will be brought forward throughout the year. If Edlen were to bring a project proposal to the RDA Board that they could all agree upon, meets code and guidelines, and requested no TIF funding, then the next step would be to draft an agreement to sell the property to them. If they do ask for TIF funding, then there would be a Participation and Development

Agreement for the RDA Board to approve. The soonest that something like that would be before the Board would be June or July, but more likely later in the year than that.

Mr. Hales thanked Melinda for her explanation and asked if the Board chooses to provide TIF funds to the developer that it means that the citizens are paying for that subsidy. Ms. Greenwood agreed, but the nice thing about RDA project areas is that the money is not paid out unless they perform on the development agreement. She warned that the RDA can only capture project funds for the life of the project area which expires in 2034 and that the longer it sits, the less money any project can bring in, and this would impact that RDA's ability to provide an incentive.

Ms. Dominguez asked how the market factors for housing units are determined by the developer and at what point in time. Ms. Greenwood stated that Edlen would have done some research while developing their proposal. Part of the requirements for a submittal by a developer was a proforma that would have included a preliminary market study. Ms. Dominguez asked if it were possible for the developers market assumptions were able to be adjusted by changing economic forces. Ms. Greenwood agreed that the assumptions and proposals can change and she referenced a project that recently adjusted the density of their project because of changing market factors. Once a project is approved, it cannot be changed without going through the official channels for an amendment. Ms. Dominguez expressed a concern that citizens in her district are feeling like they are unheard. She asked what we are doing to follow up with citizens' comments and whose responsibility is it to do the follow up. Ms. Greenwood responded that staff are always available for board members and citizens to ask questions of and are happy to provide accurate information and explain how the development process works. A lot of times, public comments are not items that can be addressed by ordinances and regulations that we have in place. As public officials, we need to help the public understand the technical information that we have available and that our decisions must be based on those data and not public impressions or sentiment. Land use law does not allow us to deny a project because of negative public comments when the project complies with our laws. Ms. Dominquez said there is a feeling of disconnect with citizens and wondered what goes into approving these projects in the terms of studies, such as traffic and environmental, as well as how they impact infrastructure and police and fire. Ms. Greenwood responded that a traffic study was done in the area of the 48th and State Street project before the RFP for the project was issued so that developers would understand the current traffic in the project area. The City Engineer can require a traffic study for any project that they feel is warranted. City code requires a traffic study when a development is at or above a certain density or units per acre. Utilizing some brownfields grant funds, the city has done an environmental study for the project site as well. For public infrastructure, we know that some powerlines will need to be relocated and RDA staff are in contact with the power department regarding that. She is not aware of any water or sewer issues, but there will be some work to be done on the storm drainage to be paid for by the developer. Impact fees are required by the city for sewer, power, storm water and water. Those impact fees are paid for by the developer and should be used for any new growth that impacts city services. Murray is at a phase in development where impact fees are not as much of a factor as a city with a lot of new growth such as Herriman. Police and fire are not covered by impact fees in Murray, so that would have to be addressed through input from the Police and Fire Chiefs and the budget process.

Project Updates – Presenter: Melinda Greenwood

Ms. Greenwood stated that that cell phone tower relocation (at the new city hall site) is under way and that construction will take between 8 to 10 weeks, putting completion at the end of March.

The 42nd South road construction is complete and Public Works Department did a great job of keeping the budget down on that project. We have approved the apartment complex's new parking lot, which should alleviate parking issues.

We have received dates for the exclusive negotiation agreement with Edlen and will be moving forward with that agreement and eventual review by the Board.

The Jesse Knight Legacy Center is still working with Utah's Department of Environmental Quality on the site clean-up for their project.

We have completed a Phase 1 and 2 environmental study for the THINK Architecture property, which was paid for by a Brownfields Coalition grant. These grants are federal funds but tend to make projects take longer.

Salt Lake County has sent us our initial 2020 tax year disbursement for the Fireclay Area, so RDA staff will work with the Finance Department and Zion's Public finance to determine TIF disbursement amounts for the property owners in the area.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Minutes drafted by Jay Baughman, Economic Development Specialist