



PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City, Utah will hold a special meeting beginning at 4:00 p.m., Tuesday, December 19th, 2023 in the Murray City Council Chambers at 10 East 4800 South, Murray, UT.

Members of the public may view the meeting via the live stream at www.murraycitylive.com or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>. Public Comments can be made in person during the meeting or may be submitted by sending an email (including your name and address) to: rda@murray.utah.gov *All comments are limited to 3 minutes or less and email comments will be read into the meeting record.*

RDA MEETING AGENDA
4:00 p.m., Tuesday, December 19th, 2023

1. **Approval of Minutes:** October 17, 2023 & November 14, 2023
2. **Citizen comments:** (see above for instructions)
3. **Action Item:** Consideration of a resolution adopting the regular meeting schedule of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City for calendar year 2024. Phil Markham presenting.
4. **Action Item:** Consideration of a resolution authorizing the purchase, sale and development agreement for the sale and development of real property located at 5025 South State Street and 149 East to 179 East Myrtle Avenue, Murray, Utah, and authorizing execution of documents to finalize the transaction. G.L. Critchfield Presenting.
 - a. RDA Board may convene to a closed Session per Utah State Code 52-4-205-1e to discuss the sale of real property: The RDA Board may reconvene in the mayor's office conference room, Suite #390 at 10 East 4800 South, Murray UT.
5. **Project Updates:** Phil Markham & Zachary Smallwood Presenting.

Special accommodations for the hearing or visually impaired will be made upon a request to the office of the Murray City Recorder (801-264-2660). We would appreciate notification two working days prior to the meeting. TTY is Relay Utah at #711.

On December 13, 2023 a copy of the Notice of Meeting was posted in accordance with Section 52-4-202(3).

Philip J Markham,
Community and Economic Development Director

~DRAFT~

The Redevelopment Agency (RDA) of Murray City met on Tuesday, October 17, 2023, at 5:00 p.m. in the Murray City Council Chambers, 10 East 4800 South, Murray, Utah.

Members of the public were able to view the meeting via the live stream at 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 three minutes or less, and written comments were read into the meeting record.

In Attendance:

RDA Board Members

Diane Turner, Chair
Pam Cotter, Vice Chair
Garry Hrechkosy
David Rodgers

Others in Attendance

Brett Hales, Executive Director
Doug Hill, Mayor's Office
G.L. Critchfield, City Attorney
Phil Markham, CED
Brenda Moore, Finance
Tammy Kikuchi, Mayor's Office
Tony Semone, NeighborWorks
Rob White, IT Dept
Pattie Johnson, Council Office
Joey Mittelman, Fire Dept
Zachary Smallwood, CED
Jennifer Kennedy, Council Office
Kathy White, Murray Area Chamber of Commerce
Matt Gibbons, Murray Area Chamber of Commerce
Members of the public, per sign-in sheet

Excused:

Rosabla Dominguez

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Turner called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Turner called for a motion to approve the minutes for August 22, 2023 and September 19, 2023. Board Member Rodgers indicated that his name was misspelled a few times, but that staff have been notified and it will be corrected.

Board Member Hrechkosy moved to approve the minutes for August 22, 2023 and September 19, 2023. Vice Chair Cotter Seconded. A voice vote was taken with all in favor.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Chair Turner opened the period for citizen comment.

Mr. Delynn Barney spoke regarding agenda item number seven, the potential sale of property 4872 South Box Elder. He argued this property should not be listed for sale, as records indicate it should not be a separate parcel. Specifically, over 100 years ago, 4872 and surrounding properties were identified as Murray City ball grounds, but the southeast corner was incorrectly referenced at that time. This mistake continued over the years, even after more recent surveys when the Murray fire station was built, which pushed boundaries north into the neighboring Rasmussen property. Mr. Barney's own property boundaries have also shifted north 10 feet due to realignments over time, and his current driveway is actually owned by Wasatch Affordable Ventures based on boundary corrections. Mr. Barney urged the board to remove 4872 from the sale list until accurate surveys can re-establish boundaries in the area, which will require significant time and expense. But 4872 should not be sold separately given evidence it should likely be part of a neighboring property.

Chair Turner, seeing no additional comments, closed the citizen comment period.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Consideration of a Resolution of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City amending the budget for the fiscal year 2023-2024

Brenda Moore spoke regarding amending the budget. She started with a brief summary of the status of RDA areas at fiscal year-end. This was to give the board a better idea about whether they can do the budget opening. She showed a map of the RDA areas.

Ore sampling site: Ms. Moore indicated that crews are working to clean up the contaminated dirt from the site. There's no activity on the books for the moment, but they have \$2.5 million the contractor will get reimbursed for once the city starts collecting and gets that building finished.

Cherry Street - The collection for this site ends in calendar 2023. They received \$139,000. Last year, there was \$52,000 for their administrative fees. They transfer money that will stop in 2024. \$37,900 was for the original build. The city just rebuilt the road and the gutters for \$317,000. For fiscal year 2024, Ms. Moore is projecting it will end up at \$35,000. They have enough to cover that \$317,000 in the budget in their fund balance.

East Vine - Nothing is happening at this site right now. They collected revenue of \$56,000. The transfer is \$15,000 in the general fund for infrastructure repayment, and the area balance at the end of 2023 is \$156,000.

Fireclay - Their collection ends in 2033. They have a 20% low-income housing. The increment collected was \$1.9 million. The property tax being collected in that area that was over the original amount that was coming in is \$1.9 million. It did what it's supposed to have done. It's increased the value in that area. Administrative fees are capped at 2% and they were \$38,000. The city reimbursed the school district 12% of the revenue they get, which was \$231,000. There are four reimbursement rate agreements going on, they have \$7.3 million, they need to pay back to them at some point that transfers funds to the wastewater and power for infrastructure

repayment. Their low-income housing balance is \$1.2 million. And their area fund balance is \$2.4 million.

Board Member Hrechkosy asked if the \$1.2 million was included in the \$2.4 million.

Ms. Moore said they're separate.

Central Business District - The increment collection stops in 2034. There is the 20% low-income housing requirement. The increment revenue was \$1.2 million. Last year, administrative fees were capped at 4%. They were \$49,000. The city reimburses the school district \$400,000 per year. There are no private reimbursement agreements right now. They are paying a 2016 bond for the property acquisition around this area, it will be paid off in the same year that the increment stops being collected, it can be called in 2027. If the board wanted to pay it off early, they would receive a transfer from the general fund for land purchases, and then the low-income housing balance is \$1.2 million. The area balance is a negative \$896,000. This site is land rich, but cash poor. As soon as we sell a piece of property or sell the site at 5025 South State Street. The first \$900,000 approximately will need to be used to make their fund balance whole.

Smelter Site - The cash and the collection for this site ends in calendar 2023. Ms. Moore will know in March of 2024 exactly how much money they will have collected. The increment revenue last year was \$1 million. They reimbursed the school district 12%, which was \$121,000. They have a low-income housing retired requirement. Their admin fees were capped at 5%, which was \$50,000 last year. Transfers \$265,000 to the general fund to repay infrastructure costs. The balance of that as of June 30 was \$1,086,000. That is part of the budget opening to allow them to repay that entire amount that's from the original street. Sales tax withheld for the homeless shelter is the other thing they're paying from there, which was \$120,000. The low-income housing balance at the end of fiscal year 2023 was \$980,000. The area balance unrestricted was \$3.1 million. So far this year, the board has authorized the downpayment assistance to NeighborWorks in the amount of \$750,000. That's including the employee downpayment assistance, as well as other funds. That's part of this budget opening also.

Board Member Hrechkosy asked if \$750,000 is part of the \$980,000, or will that be separate.

Ms. Moore replied that will come out of the \$980,000.

Chair Turner asked what an unrestricted balance means.

Ms. Moore said it means they can use it on anything that they deem will increase the viability of the area or businesses in the area. An example is the LED lights that are being put in at that site. Another example is the road projects completed recently. The RDA will reimburse itself for things of that nature. These are all in the budget opening.

Ms. Moore stated in summary, the RDA in total had \$8.7 million, \$3.5 of which was required to be used for low-income or moderate-income housing. She projects, based on this budget opening, that by the end of the year, the low-income housing will be at \$3.4 million, even though money is being spent. This is because it keeps growing. The smelter site will end up with about

\$2.3 million. Cherry Street will have \$35,000 left to spend. She anticipates they'll do sidewalk repairs or install street lighting. This budget opening that is currently being discussed, via public hearing, includes \$117,726 for the Cherry Street project came in higher than they had anticipated because they decided to rebuild the entire road, including curb and gutter. The smelter site – the Power Department has said it will cost them \$69,150 for the LED streetlight upgrade. There will need to be a reimbursement for the CIP fund for the street recent improvements done on Cottonwood and Vine for \$709,832. They need to repay Murray City the remaining reimbursement due from the original build of \$843,056. The original cost was approximately \$5.5 million. They need to include \$100,000 for the professional services to update the central area station master plan, that's the RDA's match for a grant. There will need to be \$150,000 of low-income housing setaside for the employee downpayment assistance and \$600,000 of low-income housing setaside for the NeighborWorks downpayment assistance. When the original budget was passed, Ms. Moore said they wouldn't need a budget opening. That was true if the funds were taken out of the Fireclay and the Central Business District, but since they want it to spend down the smelter site first, there needs to be a budget opening to do so.

Chair Turner thanked Ms. Moore for her presentation and opened the public hearing for comments. Seeing none, she closed the comment period. She asked the board if they had any questions or concerns.

Board Member Hrechkosy and Vice Chair Cotter shared their appreciation of the presentation.

Board Member Hrechkosy made a motion to approve a resolution of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City amending the budget for the fiscal year 2023/2024.

Vice Chair Cotter seconded.

Roll Call Vote:

Y Diane Turner
Y Garry Hrechkosy
Y Pam Cotter
Y David Rodgers

Motion passed 4-0.

ACTION ITEMS

Consideration of a resolution of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City ("RDA") approving the transfer of certain portions of real property to Murray City Corporation

Mr. Markham presented a procedural resolution to take care of the Redevelopment Agency purchase property that was included in the construction of the new City Hall complex and the extension of Hanauer Street. Those properties still reside under the ownership of the RDA. They need to be transferred to the city because they lie in the center of the redesigned Hanauer Street. Mr. Markham asked for approval on the transfer to the city.

Chair Turner opened the public hearing for comments. Seeing none, she closed the comment period.

Vice Chair Cotter made a motion for the resolution of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City (RDA), approving the transfer of certain portions of real property to Murray City Corporation.

Board Member Rodgers seconded.

Roll Call Vote:

Y Diane Turner
Y Garry Hrechkosy
Y Pam Cotter
Y David Rodgers

Motion passed 4-0.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Discussion on Relocation of the Townsend House

Mr. Markham addressed the board to present new information regarding the relocation of the Townsend House. He stated that he was unable to get a bid from a local company to move the Townsend House. The one company that has worked with the city before and moved the chapel said they didn't feel confident in moving a structure like the Townsend House given their aging equipment and workforce. They referred him to Wolf House and Building Movers, who moved the Odd Fellows Hall in Salt Lake City. The company gave a ballpark estimate of \$400,000 to move the Townsend House about 300 yards, not including site visits, tree removal, further stabilization, preparing the new site with a foundation and utilities, etc. Realistically they'd be looking at a minimum of \$500,000. Instead of moving or demolishing the Townsend House, he proposed creating a small historic square by leaving the Townsend House and the connected Margaret Cahoon house where they are, with a parking lot in between. For considerably less than \$400-500,000, we could remove the tea rose diner, restore the Cahoon house, and turn the parking lot into a plaza coordinating the two houses across from the mansion. This would concentrate the historic value of the area. Mr. Markham shared this proposal with the Murray History Committee and Arts Advisory Committee they both endorsed creating the historic square with the two houses. He doesn't have cost estimates yet but wanted to get the board's thoughts on this proposal first.

Chair Turner asked if they would then sell or rent the houses.

Mr. Markham said they would be city property, similar to the Murray Mansion. The city would have to maintain them. He said perhaps NeighborWorks could stay in the Townsend House. But that would be open to discussion. He feels it's a chance to preserve that last bit of history that ties in with the Cahoon Mansion or the Murray Mansion.

Vice Chair Cotter asked what will be done with the property where the Townsend house was to be moved.

Mr. Markham anticipates it will eventually be sold.

Vice Chair Cotter asked what his thoughts were on moving the Tea Rose Diner.

Mr. Markham said it would be torn down and they'd restore the west face of the Cahoon House.

Vice Chair Cotter asked if they would then upgrade the Townsend House.

Mr. Markham said yes, but not for operational purposes. He said it would only be for such things as tours or walk-throughs.

Chair Turner asked if it were to have community access, it would have to be brought up to code.

Mr. Markham said it would have to be safe.

Chair Turner asked how that would fit in with the vision for that area.

Mr. Markham said it would be a concession to future development of block one. It's a small area. He said the builders can design around it. Passageways and public space could be designed throughout that block.

Board Member Hrechkosy said he's not supportive of tearing these structures down and likes the idea of creating something that people can come to and be proud of in a public space. He acknowledges that it doesn't necessarily fit perfectly with the plans for that area but doesn't think spending \$500,000 is a wise choice. He feels this is a great way to preserve these historical buildings.

Mr. Markham said they are at the stage of the redevelopment that they can identify a portion of what we want to do with this area. A promenade was an idea that Orden Yost had suggested.

Mayor Hales said he'd prefer to see the Tea Rose Diner stay where it is.

Mr. Markham said the current location of Tea Rose would have to be torn down. He said they are outgrowing that location and still would have needed to move. The board could work with them to find another suitable location.

Mayor Hales said everyone wants those quaint diners and feels it would be ridiculous to get rid of it.

Mr. Markham said the chapel would be a much better situation than they have now. They would just need to build a kitchen.

Chair Turner said she thinks it's a great idea.

Mr. Markham said he'd continue to research that idea and come up with some estimates of what it would take for that conversion. He says he'll switch gears because he has been focused on moving the Townsend House.

Chair Turner said that's good because she feels moving the Townsend House is too expensive.

Vice Chair Cotter agreed that she doesn't want to spend that money. She also expressed concern that they could even move it safely, without it breaking or collapsing.

Chair Turner thanked Phil for his presentation and suggestions.

Discussion with Neighborworks of Salt Lake - Overview of Programs and Open Q & A

Mr. Semone started with an overview, stating that they currently have several different programs that they administer for the City of Murray. The first one is the Downpayment Assistance Program, which is a general program for anyone buying a home in the City of Murray who meets the qualifications of a first-time homebuyer income restriction. They've had this program for about twelve years. He said Murray City has been very generous with the funds for this program. He said that they've provided downpayment assistance to 21 homeowners, which was about \$649,000 in total. That represents close to \$8 million worth of home value. It's been a very successful program. The other one is the new down payment assistance program for city employees. It's \$150,000 per household. He said they've had several calls in the last couple of weeks. The problem is many people make too much money including their spouse's income. They are often over the 120% of area median income. Many staff have been disappointed by this, and interest in the program has dropped off. He hopes eventually they will get people who will qualify, especially if interest rates drop. He feels that the program will work best for staff who are willing to look at less expensive houses or condos.

Board Member Hrechkosy asked if the income restriction is a state requirement and if that's something that can be adjusted.

Mayor Hales thinks it can simply be adjusted.

Mr. Critchfield said since the funds are from the RDA set-aside, he wonders if that qualification is required by law.

Mr. Semone said if there's a way to increase that requirement that would be helpful. He said that Murray is different than other cities, who have a stricter requirement of 80%. This is the CDBG number (HUD funded) and NeighborWorks has told them they aren't going to be able to use the funds they've offered. They can see now even with 120% of AMI, it's difficult for people to qualify for the first mortgage and keep their income below to be able to get the downpayment assistance.

Mr. Semone then spoke about the development at Tripp Lane.

Vice Chair Cotter asked if he feels he's going to have a hard time getting people into those homes. She wondered if there were things that could be done to bring down the price of the houses, such as using more cost-effective materials or offering less amenities.

Mr. Semone said it's possible. He stated that those homes will be sold at market price, which will be about \$650,000 to \$700,000. There are two reasons for that price range. One is the cost to build. And the other reason has to do with homes being built in that neighborhood. That's the price range they are in. They're concerned about selling a home for \$600,000 when a nearly identical home across the street is selling for over \$700,000. Nearby homeowners are not going to be happy if those homes are selling below market rate price, because now that's going to be part of the comparables. If somebody refinances or sells their home, the bank will use that information to value the home. NeighborWorks is trying to be conscientious of not creating that scenario for existing homeowners in the area. They are going to build one model home and for the other lots, someone will purchase the land. The homeowner can choose from four designs, and what they put inside is up to them. They currently have a list of about 35 people who are interested. By the spring they'll reach out to those on the list. He said the way to make these some of these homes more affordable is through financing, by offering a 60/40 or 70/30 type of loan. It's not a grant, so they're not getting free money. They're paying an interest rate and the interest that they pay goes back into the fund. And if they refinance in a couple of years and pay that loan off, that money goes back into the downpayment assistance fund or home improvement grant. They could end up selling all of those homes at the market rate. Mr. Semone told the board that the builders have started to prepare the land for building. That should take about 10 to 14 days. Then they'll start putting in the street and curbs hopefully before it snows. They probably won't start building until after the first of the year.

Chair Turner thanked Mr. Semone for his presentation.

Discussion Regarding Staff Direction on Listing the Properties 4868, 4872, and 4878 South Box Elder Street

Mr. Markham stated that significant due diligence has been conducted to evaluate parcels of contaminated land, including having certified surveyors delineate the boundaries and checking county records. An appraisal was also completed on the parcels, factoring in the known contamination level, providing an estimated valuation that Mr. Markham can share privately if desired. He indicated there has been one developer interest over the past couple of years regarding this property. He said the board has two options for potentially selling the land - either negotiating terms directly with an interested private developer, or publicly listing the property on multiple listing sites, open for bids. The attorney's office recommended the RDA board get guidance from members on how they prefer to proceed - through private negotiation with a developer or a public listing/bidding process.

Chair Turner asked if the mayor would conduct the private negotiation.

Mr. Critchfield said yes.

Chair Turner asked the mayor how he wanted to proceed.

Mayor Hales thinks they should just go through the process, and they should be able to disclose the amount. He feels they can either have a closed meeting, or go into private discussions with small groups.

Chair Turner asked if that would be better for the city.

Mr. Markham asked for further clarification on whether with private negotiations with an individual that he has identified, or should it be listed with an agent like Orden Yost.

Chair Turner feels that the board doesn't need an agent.

Mr. Critchfield reiterated that there's an interested party that they can speak with them and sell it, or it can be offered for sale to the public. How they offer that can be discussed internally.

Board Member Hrechkosy asked what the disadvantage would be to having more people involved in bidding - doesn't that potentially get the RDA more money.

Mr. Critchfield stated that's the idea.

Mayor Hales said that's why he wanted to talk about the amount.

Mr. Critchfield said he can't tell how many parties would be interested because it's a rather unique parcel, containing contamination, which won't be easy to develop.

Chair Turner asked if the interested party was willing to mitigate the contamination.

Mr. Markham said yes and they do have an appraisal of the property value.

Board Member Hrechkosy asked if there was an official offer.

Phil Markham said there is no official offer yet.

Mayor Hales said they have an interested party, but he would like the board to see the appraisal and whatever they end up offering.

Mr. Critchfield stated that, with the RDA, it's different than if the city were doing this, they would have to go to the public. The question is whether the board only wants to have an internal discussion with the mayor.

Vice Chair Cotter asked if there are more bids, won't that mean more money for the RDA. She is in strong favor of entertaining additional bids. She understands that the property is contaminated and states that it's the risk a buyer takes. She understands there may not be additional offers but doesn't want to just take the first one.

Board Member Hrechkosy pointed out to Vice Chair Cotter that this process will move faster by accepting this party's offer.

Vice Chair Cotter said she did not understand what the hurry is, as the property has been sitting there for some time.

Mayor Hales said that's why it would be good to have a discussion.

Vice Chair Cotter is not comfortable moving forward with only one offer and not opening it up to the public.

Mr. Markham said he would like direction on whether the board wants private negotiation or public advertisement.

Chair Turner asked Board Member Rodgers what he'd like to do.

Board Member Rodgers said he supports going public and that the currently interested party would still have the opportunity to bid. This way, there is more transparency in the process.

Chair Turner said she prefers to leave it up to the mayor to negotiate with the currently interested party.

Mayor Hales said that if they go that direction, he'd want to have a meeting with the board to reveal the appraised value and the offer, if one is made. There will still be full public transparency. He said there is still the option to refuse the offer if the board doesn't like it.

Board Member Hrechkosy confirmed that if the offer was untenable the board could go public with requesting offers.

Mr. Markham said yes.

Vice Chair Pam Cotter stated that she wanted to go public and ensure transparency. She expressed her strong feelings of the need for transparency, in either direction they choose to go. She feels that meeting privately and accepting the potential offer of the current interested party is not being transparent.

Chair Turner assured her that the process will still be transparent to the public.

Mayor Hales said they would have a closed meeting, then if the board doesn't like the bid, they can open it up to the public. He said he does not have a preference how they do this.

Board Member Hrechkosy wanted to clarify the aspect of transparency and make sure the board is in alignment of what that means to this process. What the mayor is saying is that, regardless of what path is taken, there will be public transparency. It will be like the sale of the Arlington. The public still doesn't know the price paid or the asking price. That would be the case with this property. The property won't be listed for a price, the board will solicit bids

publicly, with the appraisal in hand, but the bidders won't know what that is. Going the public route doesn't change the level of transparency to the public – that's the same regardless of what route they go. If the board meets with the mayor and ends up not liking the proposal, the mayor will not move forward with it, even though it's an administrative function. At that point, they would go public in soliciting other bids. In that case, he's okay meeting with the individual who has already stepped forward, considering the things that are in place, and knowing that the board will be consulted and ultimately be able to either move forward or not at that point. Then they can move forward to a bidding process if they don't like the bid of the current individual.

Vice Chair Cotter asked how they will know if that's the top bid that they could get for this property. She wondered if there could be bids that could outbid this individual.

Board Member Hrechkosy said he doesn't disagree with her, but he thinks once they have the appraisal in hand, and they know what they're willing to offer, they'll have a better sense of how to proceed. His understanding is that the contamination presents a challenge to potential buyers. He feels it's worth hearing this first bid. If it comes in strong, the board may want to move forward with it. If they feel it's weak, they don't have to move forward.

Chair Turner said she'd hate to lose the option that they have at this point.

Vice Chair Cotter says she feels they won't lose it – the property's been sitting there for years.

Mr. Markham said that it hasn't been for sale until now.

Mayor Brett Hales asked the board not to jump to conclusions before they hear what the interested party will have to offer.

Board Member Rodgers said he feels confident moving forward with what's been suggested after having had this robust discussion.

Chair Turner asked Mr. Markham if he knows how to move forward with process.

Mr. Markham indicated that he does.

PROJECT UPDATES

Downtown Area Plan

Mr. Smallwood provided an update from the recent steering committee meeting, saying it was a robust discussion that will lead to some exciting outcomes. He instructed the consultant to start designing renderings showing the plans for the Townsend House area that had been discussed earlier, noting that while they had given the consultant an initial idea of where things might be located, the committee can now confirm those plans and have the consultant move forward with designing around those specifics. Overall, Mr. Smallwood said things are progressing well with the project, they still expect to have the full plan completed by the end of the year which will

provide additional details, but there will still be a lot of work left to do going into next year so people should prepare for that.

Murray Transportation Assistance Program

Mr. Markham provided an update on the Murray Transportation Assistance Program. He reported they are currently expanding advertising by distributing flyers through local schools, which has led to more applications and inquiries as people check if they qualify. Additionally, they are working on a Spanish language application to increase accessibility. In a little over a week since launching, they have had multiple applicants qualify and will be receiving their assistance cards soon, with around 4-5 cards being sent out immediately. Mr. Markham noted he doesn't have an exact number to share yet, but they are thoroughly verifying each application to responsibly steward the city's money towards those most in need. He expressed excitement about the successful launch and early response, believing this will be an impactful program moving forward.

5025 South State Street Property

Mr. Markham indicated there's not much of an update on this topic. He asked the mayor if he had anything he wanted to add.

Mayor Hales said he's hoping to have this brought to the board by the end of November or the first week of December for them to make their decision.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Turner adjourned the meeting at 6:02 P.M.



Philip J. Markham, Director
Community & Economic Development Department

~DRAFT~

The Redevelopment Agency (RDA) of Murray City met on Tuesday, November 14, 2023, at 5:00 p.m. in the Murray City Council Chambers, 10 East 4800 South, Murray, Utah.

Members of the public were able to view the meeting via the live stream at 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 three minutes or less, and written comments were read into the meeting record.

In Attendance:

RDA Board Members

Diane Turner, Chair
Pam Cotter, Vice Chair
Garry Hrechkosy
David Rodgers
Rosalba Dominguez

Others in Attendance

Brett Hales, Executive Director
Doug Hill, Mayor's Office
G.L. Critchfield, City Attorney
Phil Markham, CED Director
Patty Johnson, Council Office
Zachary Smallwood, Senior Planner
Jennifer Kennedy, Council Office
Brooke Smith, City Recorder
Joey Mittleman, Fire Department
Tammy Kikuchi, Mayor's Office
Lori Edmunds, Parks & Rec
Kim Sorensen, Parks & Rec
Kim Fong, Library
Anthony Semone, NeighborWorks
Elvon Farrell, CED Department
Jeremy Lowry, Triumph Construction
Jim Allred, Triumph Construction
Members of the public, per sign-in sheet

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Turner called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to be approved for this meeting.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Chair Turner, seeing no comments, closed the citizen comment period.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Presentation and board feedback on proposed development of the property located at 5025 South State Street with Introduction by Mayor Brett Hales.

Introduction from Mayor Hales

Mayor Hales began by thanking the board for having him and the selected group speak. He provided some background on the project, reminding the RDA board that they had hired Orden Yost from Colliers International to market the property at 5025 South State Street (the old city hall). On May 31st, 2023, the property appraised for \$14,330,000, assuming the property was developed as high-density multifamily. Colliers International received 10 proposals from developers. On June 20th, 2023, the board held a closed session to review the shortlist of the proposals. After several meetings with the RDA Chair, Vice Chair and staff, the board recommended two developers to the Mayor to move forward with. He thanked those developers that submitted their proposals. With the help of Chair Turner, Vice Chair Cotter, Phil Markham, Zachary Smallwood, Elvon Farrell, Susan Nixon and many others that Mr. Markham has involved. He selected the Triumph Group's proposal for further negotiation. He recommends them for the following reasons – The offer of \$9,520,000, although not equal to the appraisal, has the lowest residential density, which is in alignment with the board's vision and is an important issue for Murray citizens. Also, the Triumph Group proposal includes a medical office, which will enhance Murray's reputation and image as a thriving medical destination. The benefits include high paying jobs, economic development, and a healthy community. The mayor said he spoke with the board, his staff and Brenda Moore, the financial director and, with her agreement, another reason to choose Triumph's proposal is future revenue generation. The financial investment that the Triumph Group will make in the development is a significant source of property tax revenue. The proposal includes a landmark that may enrich, enhance, and define the city in this location. They are proposing owner-occupied housing, which will provide much needed housing in the city, as well as stabilize the neighborhood. The Triumph Group will use materials and design principles that enhance Murray's historic surroundings. The project will meet International Energy Conservation Code, assuring economic and environmental benefits.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is for the Triumph Group to present their proposal to you as a board. He encouraged the board to ask questions and share their comments. Following the meeting, the city and The Triumph Group will negotiate a real estate purchase contract that will be presented in December, on a date yet to be determined. He emphasized how much work has gone into the negotiation of this proposal, citing the strong desire the board has shown to do things the right way instead of the easy or quick way. He mentioned that GL Critchfield, the city attorney, and his staff have also worked hard to make this possible. He then turned the time over to the Triumph Group.

Mr. Jeremy Lowry of the Triumph group introduced himself. He stated that he is a Murray resident and that putting the proposal together had required extensive time and effort. He felt the exhaustive process led to a better outcome. He noted that public commentary during RDA meetings was considered when designing the project to align with public wants and desires. Mr. Lowry was excited to present the proposal. He stated that Triumph Group is a Murray business located on 9th East and 5151 South. Triumph has been operating for over 20 years, having previously been part of other groups. The principals of Triumph are Kenny Nichols, Jim Allred and David Killpack, who were leaders of other companies prior. Examples of buildings designed

or constructed by these individuals were shown, demonstrating experience with high quality, energy efficient buildings. Energy efficiency was stated as being important to Triumph. He explained that Triumph is interested in using the International Energy Conservation Code for the development due to potentially having clients from outside Utah who would be more familiar with this code rather than a Utah specific one. This code is used for federal buildings and nationally/internationally. Using this code was stated to deliver a high-quality building. The group's experience with constructing wonderful, long-lasting buildings was noted, giving examples of Draper City Hall, the Workers Compensation Building, and the EMI Health Building. Mr. Lowry spoke highly of Mr. Allred's integrity and ability to produce incredible work, looking forward to presenting the renderings.

The proposed mixed-use development will contain almost 180,000 square feet of medical office space. It was mentioned a letter was presented previously indicating interest from a major medical practice in the community. While not yet under contract, due to the land not yet being secured, discussions were underway with executives and the board of the practice's desire regarding participating in the development if approved. Beyond this practice, substantial interest from other medical groups was stated to have been received, with the location deemed as ideal for medical office space. Additionally, plans include a restaurant at the tower base, along with 99 for-sale condominium and townhome units. Enthusiasm was expressed regarding the residential aspect, as it would provide beautiful townhomes overlooking community jewels, while the condominiums would offer missing middle housing that is important statewide. It was shared that wanting a distinctive landmark was recognized during proposal iterations, one signifying the center of the valley. Getting creative, with inspiration drawn from St. Mark's Square in Italy, the decision was to think big and include a community gathering plaza. This was envisioned to feature nice restaurants that could become a sense of pride in the valley and attract people.

Mr. Jim Allred spoke next, noting his long association with the Murray community, having been involved for 40 years. He expressed great excitement about Murray and energy conservation, as public commentary during meetings indicated the community's priorities. As locals invested in the area, the goal was to create something unique for Murray. Contour maps from NASA were used in master planning the site's three levels of parking structure. The lowest grade level would provide secured residential parking. The next level accessible from a street cutting through the site would feature circulation to the office towers and other areas. Mr. Allred discussed being enamored with historical aspects from serving 10 years on a downtown board and conducting studies of State Street elevations for Murray in 1987. Having taught historic preservation in graduate school, incorporating a historical flair important to Murray based on public hearing commentary was a priority. The idea of creating a distinctive landmark was pursued, deciding to build a tower incorporating historical Murray building elements from State Street. The tower features a staircase leading to an observation deck with historical photos along the ascent. It was compared to climbing the long-gone smokestacks, which long-time Murray residents would appreciate. Flanking both sides would be restaurant spaces. The intent was tying in valued history while creating an identifiable modern landmark. Renderings displayed the tower staircase entrance coming down State Street. At the base would be a plaza with potential restaurant spaces to appeal to medical office tenants and the community. The area would be walkable and connected to the city. Views showed surrounding buildings, with the rear medical office building atop the parking structure. Patients could be dropped off under a glass and brick

overhang, with outdoor dining nearby. The parking area could be closed off for community events. Covered indoor dining could allow enjoying the plaza during inclement weather. Renderings from behind, facing the baseball field, displayed proposed townhomes to help screen the parking structure. Courtyards and outdoor spaces were included, along with main floor potential business space and housing above to emulate historical areas. Rooftop areas would allow viewing fireworks displays. No visible garage doors were included per Mr. Allred.

Mr. Lowry interjected regarding an interesting feature about the townhomes is that they'll have two-car garages attached, but those will be within the third (bottom) level the parking structure. He said they have a good video that illustrates what this will be like.

Chair Turner asked to confirm that there will be no garage doors on the outside.

Mr. Allred said that is correct. They face into the parking structure.

Vice Chair Cotter asked the presenters if they know how much the townhomes condos are going to be selling for.

Mr. Allred did not state a specific price, but said they were trying to accomplish having more affordable condominium units. He mentioned banks were not currently raising interest rates, expressing hope they would start to decrease to assist people in affording the planned units. He acknowledged the townhomes would likely be more expensive given their larger square footage. Referencing the renderings of the stack flats, Mr. Allred noted they were still working on the drawings having feverishly tried to complete as much detail as possible for the presentation, as his preliminary sketches apparently lacked adequate specifics. He conveyed appreciation for the chance to develop the renderings to demonstrate exactly what they hoped to achieve. The aim was to reach affordable pricing, though he observed construction costs were continually fluctuating. Mr. Allred shared having received letters in the past week about January concrete price increases, illustrating the challenges but also their eagerness to attain their affordability goal.

As the video began, Mr. Allred pointed out the gardens in the front. He said they are thinking of placing a small park in the center for residents to enjoy. He pointed out the three levels of parking in the back. He said they will cover that up with attractive townhomes, as they step up the hill, because that grade is quite steep. The grade lends itself to second floor entry for townhomes.

Mr. Allred and Mr. Lowry concluded their presentation and asked the board if they had questions.

Vice Chair Cotter asked if the Triumph Group is allowed to disclose which medical groups have expressed interest in being part of the project.

Mr. Lowry stated that, in the packet presented in May 2023, the letter from Granger Medical was included. They anticipate placing them under contract for the project.

Chair Turner asked what kind of medical facilities would be there – office or surgical.

Mr. Lowry stated there would be a combination of medical tenants. He believed the State Street five story building would likely have an imaging center, pharmacy, women's care group, family practice, cardiology groups and other specialists on the main floor that could utilize the nearby hospital for surgeries. Granger Medical felt there were many opportunities for proximity advantages with hospital-affiliated groups. Mr. Lowry thought it very likely there would be at least one if not multiple outpatient surgical centers between the two buildings. Several doctors had expressed location interest due to the hospital access. Though letters of intent were not yet in place, promising discussions were underway. In particular, Mr. Lowry felt the Arlington building raised over the parking garage would make an ideal outpatient surgical facility, allowing patients easy access down to their vehicles after procedures. His expectation was that at minimum one if not more surgical centers would occupy that building. To clarify, these would strictly be outpatient facilities without any overnight patient stays or hospital-like services. Mr. Lowry added that Granger was also considering an urgent care possibility as well.

Chair Turner confirmed that these facilities are for-profit because that's beneficial to the city's tax base.

Mr. Lowry said yes.

Rosalba Dominguez asked a question about the tower because the concept is that there would only be stairs. She's concerned about non-able-bodied people who would not be able to make it to the top of the tower but would love to see it. She wants to know if an elevator could be included.

Mr. Allred said they had not planned on including one. He said the project has already gone over budget. The tower alone is over a million dollars. He says it is unique in that regard. His alternative is to offer slides and pictures to present people who may not be able to climb the stairs.

Board Member Dominguez asked if that would be ADA compliant.

Mr. Allred said the cost to put an elevator in is approximately \$35,000 per floor, and it may change the rating of the building code. We're trying to be sensitive to that.

Vice Chair Cotter asked if the project is going to be completed all at once or if it's going to be in stages.

Mr. Allred it will be completed in stages, but that they do want to complete it as quickly as possible, stating that they have an aggressive agenda. They want to complete the project in three or four years. He acknowledges that construction takes a while. They feel the faster they do it, the the better off everyone involved will be.

Mr. Lowry said they are striving to have the parking garage completed first, stating that's an important part of this project. The project is hinged around the parking garage.

Vice Chair Cotter stated she doesn't want to see the parking structure go up and then nothing else being completed for several more years.

Mr. Lowry said their intent is to move quickly on the project.

Vice Chair Cotter said she appreciated how they incorporated the Murray Theater. She said the citizens like that as well. Being on the Feasibility Committee for the theater, that was one of the main things that they were talking about is parking for the renovated theater.

Mr. Lowry said he feels this is a great solution. The parking for public use is at the bottom lot, parking for the residents is on the upper two floors. The bottom level will be busy from 7am to 6pm, but then it will clear out for use by theater patrons.

Board Member Hrechkosy asked if there was a view that showed both sections of the townhomes and the medical. He said that when he saw the renderings of medical facilities, the thought of a college campus, which he wasn't fond of. He felt that the townhomes had the look and feel that he had envisioned for the project. He wondered if there's a way to incorporate the style of the townhome condominiums into the rest of the project. He feels like it would blend in better. He feels it has a more historic look, which he prefers.

Mr. Allred stated that they are trying to incorporate the ideas of what the physicians wanted, which was more modern. They're trying to mix the two in this project. This is why they the tower front and center, to show off the history. They're trying to pull the project together by using the brick. When they designed the townhomes, they chose to incorporate more historical aspects. They are trying to blend that to gracefully to keep the physicians happy with the new modern look. He does agree with Board Member Hrechkosy.

Board Member Hrechkosy wanted to know if there is a way to blend the brick, possibly make the tower have the same brick as the back building.

Board Member Dominguez suggested to incorporate the colors of the bricks to tie in the darker color, possibly by using red, to help the color stand out.

Mr. Allred agreed. He said it's challenging to get just the right color for the renderings on the computer.

Board Member Dominguez agreed. She said she assumes that his plan is to make it more cohesive, that's what the board desires.

Mr. Allred said they do have the challenge of having the housing have richer colored brick, yet have the medical buildings being more muted. He says there is a science to that. The point is not to confuse the public into thinking the condominiums are medical offices. That's why they chose those colors.

Board Member Hrechkosy wanted to make sure to avoid presenting an institutional look for the medical offices. He then said he wanted clarification from the group regarding the funds for

moderate low-income housing set aside in the RDA. He wanted to know if it can be used to help as an incentive to bring families into these townhomes and condominiums.

Mr. Critchfield said that it is supposed to be used at the site where the income was generated . The funds can be used off site in certain circumstances. He doesn't feel that would apply in this case.

Board Member Hrechkosy asked if this property is in an RDA zone.

Mr. Critchfield said it was, but it isn't any longer.

Board Member Hrechkosy said that's confusing and wanted to know why they're voting on it.

Mr. Critchfield said that the RDA owns the land.

Mr. Markham said the project is located in the MCCD, which is a redevelopment zone. However, the restrictions placed on low-income housing would not apply to these condominiums.

Mr. Markham noted that as far as the final design and materials, that will flesh out in the process. The Triumph Group will be working with the Planning Commission, and the Design Review committee.

Board Member Hrechkosy acknowledged the amount of work that's been put into this and noted that it's remarkable, expressing his appreciation for all the thought and time that went into this.

Board Member Dominguez asked about the possibility of using existing brick or materials from the Arlington in this project.

Mr. Lowry said he doesn't know if it's feasible to reclaim it to use it in the structure, but they plan to use it at different points within the tower complex as homage to the Arlington. He noted that there some residents have deep emotions about it, so they'd like people to enjoy seeing the bricks in the tower complex in the restaurants. He said he hopes it's apparent that they've listened to the public, and tried to try to come up with a concept that is beautiful. He is hopeful that the restaurants will enjoy regular clientele from the residents. He really wants to see the area become a community gathering center for residents.

Board Member Dominguez about the demolition of the Arlington, wanting to know what the process will be and who will be responsible for that.

Mr. Markham said that once the property is sold to the Triumph Group, they own everything on the property.

Board Member Dominguez said she asked because she know some residents may want pieces of the building as mementos.

Board Member Rodgers asked about what the developers envision for the stack homes. He wanted to know what variety of floor plans they are thinking of offering.

Mr. Allred said they have a lot of experience in this area. They plan to do a market study to determine the demographics of buyers and what they are looking for.

Mr. Lowry said he thinks there will be one-bedroom, two-bedroom and some three-bedroom units.

Chair Turner asked Mr. Allred about the idea of a live-work situation for the condominiums and how that would work.

Mr. Allred said that the main level of the condominium is the workstation, with stairs going up to the kitchen and family area on the second floor, then bedrooms on the third floor. The main level work area would have extra insulation in there, so that they can't hear the kids crying in the background. So that while you're on your computer, conducting business, your family's just next door or upper level.

Chair Turner asked how parking work in that scenario.

Mr. Allred said there will be public parking in the parking structure.

Mr. Lowry noted that this project has ample parking residents and visitors.

Mr. Allred felt most of the parking will be taken up by residents working from home, not necessarily by clients needing parking for meetings.

Board Member Dominguez also pointed out that this area is not zoned for certain types of high traffic businesses.

Mr. Lowry feels the condominiums will appeal more to the working professional in a higher income bracket. The stack units, depending upon how many bedrooms they have could lend themselves more towards residents who would meet the 80% AMI requirement for loan assistance.

Rosalba Dominguez spoke more on this development, because this is in her area of her constituency. She feels the board has a great opportunity to bring more medical facilities to Murray with this project. She feels quite proud that the board this collectively. She said she does respond to her constituents, and many of them want something that's going to generate income for Murray. She is pleased with the choice of developer because they understand the desires of the board and residents because they are also from Murray. She thanked the group for their presentation.

Mr. Lowry thanked the board for the opportunity to work on this project. He expressed their strong desire to create a project they would be proud of and would stand the test of time.

Mr. Allred commended the board for their efforts and thanked them for building this facility in Murray. He thanked them for what they've done for the community.

Board Member Rodgers asked how tall they anticipate the tower will be.

Mr. Allred Well said there's an area in the code that allows a tower. Part of the reason not to put an elevator in it is that I will pass the code to be 74 feet to the observation area. Then they can go above that because the code it's an "ornament" of sorts.

Chair Turner thanked the Triumph Group for their presentation.

PROJECT UPDATES

Mr. Markham stated that this has been a long session, back-to-back with a long committee of the whole. He stated he didn't have any urgent updates. Several things are just pending at this point and will be ready to give update on in the next meeting.

Rosalba Dominguez asked what the next steps in the sale of the property are.

Phil Markham is that the development agreement must be crafted and signed between the city and the developers. Mr. Critchfield is working on that. Then the real estate contract is created, and the transaction takes place.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Turner adjourned the meeting at 6:09 P.M.



Philip J. Markham, Director
Community & Economic Development Department

RESOLUTION NO. R_____

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MURRAY CITY FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2024.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City as follows:

1. The regular meeting schedule of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City for calendar year 2024 shall be as provided in the attached schedule.
2. The Redevelopment Agency of Murray City reserves the right to change the schedule or cancel any meetings it deems necessary consistent with the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act.
3. The City Recorder is directed to publish the attached schedule.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City, Murray City, Utah, this day of , 2023.

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MURRAY CITY

Diane Turner, Chair

ATTEST:

Brooke Smith, City Recorder

ATTACHMENT

Meeting Schedule of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City
for Calendar Year 2024



REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MURRAY CITY

2024 MEETING SCHEDULE

The following dates are scheduled for the Redevelopment Agency meetings for the year 2024. The Agency generally meets on the third Tuesday of each month. Meeting start times, location and/or format (in-person versus electronic only) are yet to be determined and will be published with the individual meeting agenda.

Tuesday, January 2nd

Tuesday, January 16th

Tuesday, February 20th

Tuesday, March 19th

Tuesday, April 16th

Tuesday, May 21st

Tuesday, June 18th

Tuesday, July 16th

Tuesday, August 13th

Tuesday, September 17th

Tuesday, October 15th

Tuesday, November 19th

Tuesday, December 3rd

RESOLUTION NO. R _____

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE, SALE AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR THE SALE AND DEVELOPMENT OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5025 SOUTH STATE STREET AND 149 EAST TO 179 EAST MYRTLE AVENUE, MURRAY, UTAH, AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS TO FINALIZE THE TRANSACTION.

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City (“RDA”) is the owner of real property located at 5025 South State Street, and 147 East to 179 East Myrtle Avenue, Murray, Utah (the “Property”) described more particularly on the attached Exhibit A (the “Property”); and

WHEREAS, RDA selected the proposal submitted by the Triumph Group Murray, LLC (Purchaser) from that of others who also submitted proposals seeking to purchase the Property and having engaged with Purchaser in further discussions to clarify Purchaser’s commitment for the future use and development of the Property, RDA is willing to sell the Property to Purchaser in accordance with the terms set forth in the proposed Real Estate Purchase, Sale and Development Agreement attached as Exhibit B (“Agreement”); and

WHEREAS, the RDA Board wants to authorize the Executive Director to sign all documents necessary to finalize the transaction, including the Agreement and closing documents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City as follows:

1. It hereby authorizes the Real Estate Purchase, Sale and Development Agreement for the property located at 5025 South State Street and 149 East to 179 East Myrtle Avenue, Murray, Utah as provided in substantially the form of agreement attached as Exhibit B.
2. The Executive Director of the RDA shall have authority to execute the Real Estate Purchase, Sale and Development Agreement, as well as any and all documents necessary to complete the purchase and sale.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City on this day of 2023.

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MURRAY CITY

Diane Turner, Chair

ATTEST:

Brett A. Hales, Executive Director

EXHIBIT A

Legal description of the Property:

Parcel 1:

The land hereinafter referred to is situated in the City of Murray, County of Salt Lake, State of UT, and is described as follows:

COMMENCING AT A POINT ON THE EAST SIDE OF STATE STREET 896.1 FEET EAST AND 520.34 FEET NORTH FROM THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 7, TOWNSHIP 2 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN; RUNNING THENCE NORTH ALONG SAID EAST LINE OF STATE STREET 347.82 FEET; THENCE EAST 421.80 FEET MORE OR LESS TO THE WEST LINE OF THE GEORGE D. EGAN PROPERTY; THENCE SOUTH 29.8 FEET MORE OR LESS TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID EGAN PROPERTY; THENCE EAST 164 FEET MORE OR LESS TO THE WEST LINE OF JONES COURT; THENCE SOUTH ALONG SAID WEST LINE 318.02 FEET MORE OR LESS; THENCE WEST 585.5 FEET MORE OR LESS TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PORTION WHICH LIES WITHIN THE BOUNDS OF ARLINGTON AVENUE.

APN: 22-07-157-043-0000

Parcel 2:

The land hereinafter referred to is situated in the City of Murray, County of Salt Lake, State of UT, and is described as follows:

A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER AND LOT 2 OF SECTION 7, TOWNSHIP 2 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, MURRAY CITY, SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT 1076.57 FEET EAST AND 520.18 FEET NORTH FROM THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 7, WHICH IS ALSO 950.19 FEET SOUTH 00°03'49" WEST ALONG THE MONUMENT LINE OF STATE STREET AND 245.88 FEET EAST FROM THE MONUMENT AT THE INTERSECTION OF STATE STREET AND VINE STREET AND RUNNING THENCE EAST 408.80 FEET TO THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF JONES COURT; THENCE SOUTH 165.37 FEET ALONG SAID STREET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE WITH A 20.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE TO THE RIGHT; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY 31.42 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 90°00'00" (CHORD BEARS SOUTH 45°00'00" WEST 28.28 FEET) TO THE NORTHERLY BOUNDARY OF MYRTLE

AVENUE; THENCE WEST 388.80 FEET ALONG SAID STREET; THENCE NORTH 185.37 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

APN: 22-07-157-046-0000

The Land described herein also known by the street address of:
5025 S State Street, Murray, UT 84107
147 E Myrtle Ave., Murray, UT 84107

EXHIBIT B

**REAL ESTATE PURCHASE, SALE AND
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**