

The Redevelopment Agency (RDA) of Murray City met on Tuesday, July 19, 2022, at 2:00 p.m. with an on-site tour and discussion of properties in the Fireclay RDA project area at the Murray North TRAX Station, located at 85 W. Fireclay Avenue. After the tour, the meeting was moved to the Murray City Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Members of the public were able to view the meeting via the live stream at <http://www.murraycitylive.com/> or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>. Public comments could be made in person or by submitting comments via email at: rda@murray.utah.gov. Comments were limited to 3 minutes or less, and written comments were read into the meeting record.

RDA Board Members

Diane Turner, Chair
Rosalba Dominguez
Pam Cotter
Kat Martinez
Garry Hrechkosy

Others in Attendance

Brett Hales, RDA Executive Director
G.L. Critchfield, City Attorney
Jared Hall, Community & Economic Dev.
Brooke Smith, RDA Secretary
Doug Hill
Zac Smallwood, Community & Economic Dev.
Tammy Kikuchi
Brenda Moore, Finance
Pattie Johnson
Maren Patterson, Planning Commission
Members of the Public as shown on sign-in sheet

Diane Turner reconvened the meeting in the council chambers at 3:13 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Martinez moved to approve the meeting minutes from June 21, 2022. Motion SECONDED by Ms. Dominguez. A voice vote was made, motion passed 5-0.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Jared Hall read the following email into the record:

Clark Bullen – Resident

Hello RDA Board Members, thank you for conducting this survey regarding the downtown. I was pleased to see the results reflect similar preferences to the feedback received from the Edlen Block One open house and a familiar sentiment to the citizen generated priorities in the master plan. I believe that citizen input supports implementing historic design requirements in the downtown area, ensuring a cohesive, purposeful and attractive downtown destination. I further believe it supports reinstating the historic protections previously in place for historically significant buildings. Without historic design requirements we end up with a hodgepodge of unsightly buildings, such as the designs for the seven story apartments on Vine Street that do not fit the preferences expressed by citizens for downtown. Whether we partner with a developer or sell the properties to buyers who believe in our vision, I believe our downtown can indeed be a beautiful historic looking destination that attracts people, new businesses and tax revenue to Murray.

Rachel Morot – Resident

Wanted to thank the city for conducting the official survey, and was very pleased to see the results of it bore out what we had been talking about and saying that citizens wanted. Glad that we had numbers that were similar to what the commentary was on the Edlen open house, and I am glad that we now have the hard data to back this up. I feel like there is a great opportunity for us as a city right now. As I had been speaking with David Amott who is head of the Preservation Utah, he had said that other cities that are surrounding us like Holladay and some of these that are redeveloping their downtowns and have done an aesthetic job of that are really trying to copy what Murray already has. I think he's right, it's a diamond in the rough, but it is a diamond, and I feel like we have an opportunity here to build in things that are sensitive to the architecture that we already have that is historic. I hope that with the citizens making their voices heard officially that that will be the track that is taken. I really do appreciate that the city has slowed down and taken time to really find out what the constituency wants, and I did want to thank you all officially for that. I had also had this conversation with some of you earlier that if the survey showed that the citizens really don't care about historic preservation then I would have to reassess my efforts in what we are doing privately in our foundation because there is no sense in going against what a community really wants. Now we are seeing generally and as a majority what citizens seem to want. I thank you for taking the time to do that and hope that we are looking forward to a really great revitalization of our downtown.

ACTION ITEM

Consider adoption of a resolution to authorize a pilot program providing transportation cost assistance for low and moderate income households located near transit stations.

Mr. Hall said this is an ask for an appropriation of about \$250,000 from the affordable housing funds set aside in the RDA. They would like to try a program where they make transit available to those that qualify. Those qualifications have not been set yet, but it would be assumed that it would be available to households making only certain percentages or less of the area median income, and that there would be a geographic requirement to live within a certain distance of transit opportunity. There is a really good potential partner that won't cost a lot of money, 97% of the money appropriated would go to benefit those people using that transportation, and if those households really need it, it could make a big difference. The group is called Esther that will help put the money on debit cards and get those distributed to people. This would be run for 6 months. The cost for us to operate this in conjunction with the partner is a flat fee with no hidden costs coming later, based on the amount of money we choose to put on the debit cards for people to use for the transit.

Ms. Dominguez asked how many families this would service, and are they qualified based off of their AMI.

Mr. Hall responded that this would be based off the AMI, and they still have to decide how they will qualify that, whether based off tax records or other means, and what the benefit would be. Another attractive point of this program is that there isn't a lot of need for staff to operate that kind of program. It is a dashboard program that would supply a lot of good data as the cards are used and they can decide if they want to go further with it. They would use that time during the pilot program's roll out to see if it is successful, and then look for sources of funding it further, rather than looking back to the set aside funds again.

Ms. Cotter asked how they would use the cards, for taxi, TRAX, etc.

Mr. Hall replied it would be for public transportation only, TRAX, busses, etc. Once they pay to get on TRAX they can get on any bus they'd like also, so it goes even further once you're on it.

Ms. Cotter said that she was thinking it might be like the program in Portland where, as long as you have car insurance, you can rent a car and keep it for however long you need, dropping it off at the station where the other cars are stored.

Mr. Hall noted that would be a much more expensive program, this is just for UTA services. UTA does have something called On Demand, but that's not available in this area.

Ms. Dominguez said this might be a conversation for later, but she asked about the possibility of a similar program for the staff to have transit passes, being that they are in a great location for transit.

Mr. Hall said there is already a program where if an employee demonstrates that they are riding public transit for the majority of their commute trips, there is some kind of benefit.

Ms. Dominguez moved to approve and consider an adoption of a resolution to authorize a pilot program providing transportation cost assistance for low and moderate income households located near transit stations. Motion SECONDED by Ms. Martinez.

Roll Call Vote

- A Garry Hrechkosy
- A Kat Martinez
- A Pamela Cotter
- A Rosalba Dominguez
- A Diane Turner

Motion Passed 5-0

DISCUSSION ITEM

Presentation of results from the community survey conducted by Y2 Analytics

Kyrene Gibb with Y2 Analytics reviewed their methodology before going over the results. In total, they surveyed 939 Murray residents, and the data in this survey has all been weighted to best approximate the city's overall population with regard to age, gender, ethnicity, home ownership and city council district. She shared a map from the meeting packet that showed the approximate geographic location of each resident respondent; there was pretty good coverage citywide, within each of the five city council districts. The surveys were in the field for about three weeks in June, from June 3 to June 29, and they sent mail, email and text message invitations for residents to participate in the survey. In a city Murray's size, 939 responses to a survey results in a margin of error of about 3.2% for all citywide estimates. She shared some key findings that are available with additional details in the attached results. Looking at the city overall, residents expressed relatively high levels of satisfaction. Over 2/3 of residents say they feel the city is headed in the right direction, and a vast majority would recommend the city as a good place to live. Regarding the downtown area and Block One in its current state, there is a little less enthusiasm. Residents are a little bit concerned about some of the direction of development, or options considered for development downtown, specifically the possibility of too much high density housing and a desire for more of a local hometown/downtown feel. When asked if residents would support the redevelopment of the Block One area there was majority support; there was not a real conclusion around how that development should be funded. Overall, they found that a majority of residents are interested in preserving the historic look and feel of Murray City, they would like to maintain the character of the city that they know and love. Some other important considerations in residents' minds were walkability, places to gather, and open

and relaxed commercial environments. She reviewed the overall “health of the city” metrics from the attached survey results which included the following:

- Over 2/3 of residents say the city is headed in the right direction.
- There is an even split regarding the question of whether the city is getting better or worse. More than 1/3 of residents are in the middle and feel the city is about the same as it has been.
- 17% of residents, or just shy of 1 in 5 residents say they haven’t been here long enough to make that 5 year comparison.
- Regarding overall quality of life in the city, there is an average rating of 77 on the zero to 100 scale, and distribution by council district is about similar. There are slightly higher than average ratings in Districts 2, 4 and 5 with District 5 residents expressing the highest overall satisfaction with their quality of life.
- When asked how likely residents are to recommend Murray to others as a good place to live, an overwhelming majority of 86% would be at least somewhat likely to recommend the city. That response was also quite consistent across council districts.
- Regarding the character or atmosphere of the city, a majority of residents agree that Murray is a great place to raise a family and that there are currently enough parks, open spaces and recreation areas to meet their needs.
- Regarding desired businesses, a majority agrees that Murray does have all the businesses they’d like to see.
- Most residents like the current look and feel of the city, 60% total agree with that sentiment with 18% strongly agreeing.
- Regarding activities and amenities for youth in the community, 2/3 majority agrees the city has opportunities for the youth. However, there are more residents in the neither agree nor disagree category.
- Regarding whether Murray is developing in a positive way, 54% of residents agree, but 30% of residents disagree with that sentiment.
- Residents were least likely to agree with the following statements:
 - Whether Murray does a great job of preserving the historical character of the area with only 48% agreeing with that statement.
 - Only 35% of residents said they like living in Murray because of the businesses and job opportunities that are growing here.
- When asked what types of businesses are missing in Murray, some of the responses that came up the most often were restaurants, small local businesses, creative and artistic businesses, locally owned restaurants and businesses.
- When asked what residents would like to see less of, some of the responses were: shopping centers being a blight on the community, more businesses as the city are already too busy, growth of high-density housing.
- Regarding Downtown Murray, there is a heat map attached that shows the areas residents most commonly associate with the downtown area. The majority indicated the area around 4500 S and State Street to about 5300 S.
- When asked to what extent residents agree or disagree with some statements about downtown, three out of four residents agree that they would like to see historic buildings in the city rehabilitated; in addition, 38% of residents strongly agree and 73% in total agree they would like to see the downtown area updated with more attractions.
- A 2/3 majority of residents like the historic buildings and character of the downtown area, but most residents do not think of Downtown Murray currently as a destination in the city.
- For the residents who do visit the downtown area, the things taking them there now are primarily the dining opportunities. The majority of those residents eating downtown are doing so at least a few times a year. Just shy of the majority of residents are also shopping or participating in family activities, going out for a romantic evening.
- Residents rated the following things in the historic downtown district highly:

- The walkability or pedestrian friendliness at 40% of residents rating that as excellent or good.
- Available parking.
- The atmosphere.
- Regarding the look and appearance, just shy of 1/3 of residents suggest that gets an excellent or good rating at this time.
- The areas that are most in need of improvement from residents' perspectives are the retail and shopping options, activities and entertainment options, and housing options available.
- When asked specifically about Block One and the immediate surrounding area, residents responded with similar evaluations. The atmospheric rating for Block One performs worse than downtown as a whole, as does the look and appearance of Block One.
- Residents would most like to see the following in Downtown Murray:
 - 74% would be interested in seeing increased dining options.
 - 62% would be interested in seeing new activities and entertainment options.
 - 60% would like to see new retail and shopping options.
 - 57% would like to see an improvement in the look and appearance of the area.
 - 50% would like to see the city preserve and restore historic buildings and character.
 - 47% would like to improve the overall atmosphere.
 - 41% would like to improve the walkability or pedestrian friendliness.
 - 28% would like to add or improve parking options.
 - 20% would like to add or improve housing options and availability. They would like to see improved housing options in the downtown area, but not more apartments or potential high-rise housing options; building height seems to be the biggest issue.
 - More green space and open space, gathering areas.
- Specifically regarding Block One redevelopment and resident support:
 - 40% of residents would strongly support the redesign of Block One in the historical downtown district.
 - By council district, the strong support of redeveloping the downtown area is more clustered in District 3, compared to District 1 and 2.
 - When asked if residents would rather raise taxes to redevelop the area or maintain current tax levels and sell the land to be developed privately, there was a statistical tie with 54% of residents saying they would prefer to have the city sell the area; that response did vary by council district.
 - When asked if residents would support the city using tax dollars to restore historic buildings in Murray, 26% would strongly support it with 2/3 of residents at least somewhat supporting that endeavor.
 - When asked if residents would support the city replacing some historic buildings with new buildings that maintain the historic look and feel, 70% total would support that with 23% strongly supporting that.
 - When asked what residents would like to see in Block One, residents listed additional dining options, boutiques and shops, small businesses, and entertainment venues.

Ms. Turner mentioned seeing bars and pubs noted as a response to this in the survey results, she asked if they were grouping that with restaurants.

Ms. Gibb said that came out a lot in the open ended responses, in the "other" category. The above results were specifically from just the closed ended categories that they had respondents choose from. She then continued with her review of the results.

- When asked what the residents' value based priorities were for the downtown area, the majority of them feel beautification of the area was the most important; only 3% of residents said that was not very important or not important to them. Other priorities that had a strong majority of support included:
 - 52% of residents said improving the walkability and pedestrian friendliness of downtown.
 - 46% of residents said stores they can afford.
 - 41% of residents respectively said it was "very important that we maintain the look and feel of our neighborhoods" and "we prioritize housing affordability."
 - About 1/3 of residents responded that open space, transportation and infrastructure, and economic development were important considerations.
 - One in four residents said accessible transportation options was a very important consideration.
- Regarding keeping Downtown Murray as-is, not many residents are committed to the current state of the downtown area.
- When asked whether residents would rather see more open space for public use or more mixed-use housing and retail space, there was a slight lean towards public open space but it was basically a tie.
- When asked whether residents would rather see on street parking, on State Street specifically, or more parking lots nearby, residents strongly preferred parking lots nearby.
- Regarding restoring and maintaining the historic character, 61% of residents would prefer that over modernized architecture and 61% of residents would prefer a low-rise building profile over taller, multi-story buildings.

Ms. Martinez asked if there was a firm definition of "low-rise."

Ms. Gibb believes they had a three story cap on the current low-rise building profile, as that's what on State Street now.

Ms. Cotter noted that the three story building gained 67% of the support if that's the definition that was given.

Ms. Gibb continued with her review of the survey results by explaining that they performed a conjoined experiment to ask residents to evaluate a variety of these aspects of potential downtown development in a package together, rather than asking them to rank and consider all of these features individually. They gave residents a hypothetical scenario in which a mixed-use development was being built downtown and they were given two options, with a random assignment from the pre-selected five feature attributes. Detailed results are included in the meeting packet and below are summaries of those results:

- Atmosphere was the most important determinant, with uses and height statistically tied for second place followed by appearance and then parking being the lowest priority but still a significant determinant of what residents are picking.
- When looking at the individual aspects of each feature, wider sidewalks are more positively correlated with selection of options, commercial space is more preferable as a solitary development option than mixed use or residential space, but mixed use is relatively more popular than strictly residential space.
- Buildings three stories or less, or no more than 40 feet high, are positively correlated with residents selecting that option. Taller buildings are not something residents are eager to see.
- Parking Garages on site are the most popular potential parking situation that residents would be interested in seeing downtown, compared to on site or on street parking.
- New open space or walkable plazas and courtyards are significantly more preferable than a development option that does not include new open space. Walkable plazas and

courtyards are the most significant driver overall with the highest correlation score, which means they were most frequently associated with residents choosing an option that included that feature.

Ms. Gibb explained that they did some image testing to determine what residents would prefer to see. Those images are included in the packet for this meeting, and here are the summarized results:

- The three story buildings were more popular than the two story buildings.
- When asked whether residents would rather see a basic streetscape or an elaborate streetscape, they were much more interested in an elaborate streetscape.
- Three out of four residents strongly preferred traditional architecture, compared to modern architecture.
- Some incorporation of walkable plazas and open space were overwhelmingly preferred to no additional open space.
- Wide streets were significantly more preferable to narrow streets.
- Residents preferred to see a median in the street.
- Mixed use development would be preferable to residential development in the downtown area.

Ms. Dominguez asked for their definition of mixed use.

Ms. Gibb referred to a picture used in the survey, and which is included in the meeting packet. She continued with her summary of the results:

- Residents were more interested in seeing a wide sidewalk than a narrow sidewalk.
- Some sort of arts or entertainment features being included in the downtown redevelopment was strongly preferable to strictly commercial space.

Ms. Gibb said they asked about building materials for the facades of potential redevelopment and new development downtown. Mixed materials that included brick were the most preferred building mediums, followed by stone and painted brick; after that, they fall pretty significantly below the 50% threshold. When asked which building materials were the most preferred, again brick is overall the most popular with more than 1/3 of residents indicating that would be their strongest preference.

Ms. Cotter said she would like to see what all these preferred options would look like put together, to see how it feels.

Ms. Gibb said they also did some image testing with photos of other downtown areas and commercial centers in the valley, asking residents what aspects of those images were the most appealing. The most appealing aspects are summarized below:

- Elaborate landscape elements.
- Art, lights and lampposts that are decorative and increase the walkability and atmosphere of the area.
- Wide sidewalks.
- Storefronts and businesses with the boutique feel.

Ms. Turner noted that could be done with xeriscaping.

Ms. Gibb moved to discussing the 9th and 9th area comparison, many residents liked the incorporation of art, greenery, and the wide sidewalks. In a picture from the Downtown Holladay area, the light posts, wide sidewalks, mixed use building development, and wide street were what

residents found the most appealing. Regarding an image from Sugarhouse, there was some focus on the sculpture in the bottom right of the image, greenery, wide sidewalks and patio seating. Overall, they asked residents to describe briefly, in their own words, what they liked about some of those other downtown areas that were shown, their responses included the following:

- Narrow streets with dividing landscape for safety.
- Wide streets with a walkable, casual feel.
- Family oriented areas.
- Open atmosphere.
- A place that feels like a destination, a fun place to go.
- Space for outdoor shopping and dining.

Ms. Gibb reviewed the sample composition of respondents to the survey, and that data is included in the survey results.

Ms. Cotter asked about the survey result that indicated 83% of residents admitted they are not currently involved in any community groups. There wasn't anything about religion included in the results, and there are several religious groups that are involved in the community.

Ms. Gibb noted that level of involvement varies very dramatically by age group, religious affiliation, etc. How one resident connects and involves themselves in the community might not be through those types of boards and outward participation that we traditionally think of and were asking about in this survey.

Ms. Cotter said that, based on the wording, she was thinking of people that work at the senior citizen center and they might have thought that wasn't included in that question. She feels that question could have been worded differently, and that number could have been a little higher.

Ms. Gibb said this isn't a condemnation on residents, they were asking specifically if residents are involved in things that require expendable time and potentially expendable income. So to see one in five residents who are participating in that is still a positive recognition of health and opportunities to be involved in the city.

Ms. Dominguez asked if there was any correlation to career oriented folks who may just not have the time. The city does have a higher population of educated residents, and she wonders if that could be the correlation.

Ms. Gibb said it could be, but they haven't looked into it at the level. When talking about volunteer organizations and that type of community involvement, it does require available time that many residents might not have.

Mr. Hrechkosy referred back to the data on the ages of the respondents and noted that Ms. Gibbs said it was harder to sample the younger people. He asked if this distribution is in fact representative of their city demographics.

Ms. Gibb responded that in Murray City as a whole, they look at the 18-34 category collapsed, which is about 25% of Murray residents, which does make this representative. The 18-24 and 25-34 breakout would have to be looked into, as she doesn't have that number readily available. She also confirmed that the older ages, specifically 64+, are also matching at 25% of the residents. She continued reviewing the sample composition of residents as contained in the survey results.

Mr. Hales said that this information is exactly what he heard when knocking doors, so he is not surprised by most of these results.

Ms. Turner noted that she was surprised by how often brew pubs and bars came up.

Ms. Dominguez thanked Ms. Gibb for helping them get through this, and collectively putting it all together. She has been hearing these things in her district since she started, but it was refreshing to have the information and share it with the rest of the council.

Ms. Cotter said she had several questions about the appendix. She will address some of those with the mayor. There are some things citizens are very concerned about, like police, and some other issues like streets. She feels like these results are the voice of the citizens, and that they need to really look at this. She doesn't know how the council wants to work on that, but it took her four hours to read all the comments and she highlighted some of those responses.

Ms. Dominguez believes everyone has gone through the packet in detail, and they are not isolated in that. She does believe that those who were recently elected got first-hand what residents want, and it's a good reminder that residents' voices are valuable, and they do elect them, so they need to work in tandem with them on some of these things; this is a good starting point.

Mr. Hrechkosy would like everyone to remember that preserving the historic feel and updating these buildings is definitely something they need to focus on, but that costs a lot of money, and the citizens don't necessarily want to pay for it. There is a very interesting opposition there that they will have to explore, because things are great as long as there is money to pay for them.

Ms. Dominguez noted that there are programs within the state and state organizations that do want to help with these efforts, they just needed that data to help them get there. It doesn't mean they have to make it all the same, it's about how the area feels; from the historical community they were leading in that feel and she's not sure where that was lost.

Mr. Hales was impressed with this survey, and he thanked Ms. Gibb for that. In his opinion, many of the things he has seen are things he is excited to move forward with.

Doug Hill commented that his thoughts are along what Ms. Turner was talking about, the question is always what to do with this information. As staff, council, and mayor, they now need to look at the MCCD and TOD ordinances, as the MCCD ordinance does not mimic what the survey results are. As they move forward and talk about selling this property, or developing or selling Block One, they need to get the ordinance right. If they don't match the ordinance to what the survey wishes are, then they will not be able to stop somebody from doing something that the citizens don't want. Right now, for instance, the MCCD allows for buildings up to 10 stories tall, and the lowest you can go is four stories; that is just one example of something that doesn't match the desire of the residents.

Mr. Hall said the best zone for the downtown is really the MCCD, because in many ways it was written for that area. There are things that don't match with the survey, and it would probably be more efficient to prune rather than replant.

Diane Turner adjourned the meeting at 4:19 p.m.