



REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MURRAY CITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA

Tuesday, October 20, 2026

3:30 P.M. MDT

Murray City Council Chambers, 10 East 4800 South, Murray, Utah

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City, Utah will hold a regularly scheduled meeting beginning at 3:30 p.m. MDT, Tuesday, October 20, 2026, 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/>. Emails may be submitted to: rda@murray.utah.gov.

All citizen comments are limited to 3 minutes or less and email comments will be entered into the meeting record.

1. **Approval of Minutes:** September 15, 2026
2. **Citizen Comments:** (see above for instructions)
3. **Authorization Meeting:** Consider a resolution acknowledging the holding of an Authorization Meeting as required by subsection 59-36-201(1) of the Utah Code and, pursuant to subsection 59-36-201(3), and directing staff to submit the required disclosure required by subsection 59-36-201(3) of the Utah Code before triggering tax increment collection for the Ore Sampling Mill Project Area. – Chad Wilkinson presenting.
4. **Action Item:** Consider a resolution of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City (“RDA”) directing staff to cease all activities relating to the marketing and sale of the real property located with the Central Business District at approximately 4868 South Box Elder Street, Murray, Utah. – Chad Wilkinson presenting
5. **Update Item:** Update on the Old City Hall site – Chad Wilkinson presenting
6. **Update Item:** Update on future RDA project areas – Chad Wilkinson presenting

7. Update Item: Update on the Murray Chapel property renovation – Chad Wilkinson presenting

8. Board Member Requests for Future Agenda Items

Pursuant to Utah Code §59-36-201, notice is hereby given that the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City will conduct an authorization meeting in conjunction with its regularly scheduled Board of Directors meeting on October 20, 2026, at 3:30 p.m., in the Murray City Council Chambers, 10 East 4800 South, Murray, Utah.

The authorization meeting concerns the proposed triggering of property tax increment collection for the Ore Sampling Mill Community Reinvestment Area in accordance with the previously adopted Project Area Plan and Project Area Budget.

The disclosure information required under Utah Code §59-36-201(3)(b) through (g), including the supporting 40-year financial analysis, is available for public review at:

<https://www.murray.utah.gov/2271/Ore-Sampling-Mill-CRA---Tax-Increment-Au>

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.

At least 10 days prior to the meeting, a copy of the foregoing notice was sent to the City Recorder to post in conspicuous view in the front foyer of the Murray City Center, Murray, Utah. A copy of this notice was also posted on Murray City's website www.murray.utah.gov and the state noticing website at <http://pmn.utah.gov>.



MURRAY CITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

MEETING MINUTES

September 15, 2026

5:30 P.M. MDT

Murray City Council Chambers, 10 East 4800 South, Murray, Utah

MEMBERS PRESENT

RDA Board Members

Diane Turner, Chair
Paul Pickett, Vice Chair
Pam Cotter
Adam Hock
Clark Bullen

Others in Attendance

Mayor Brett Hales, RDA Executive Director
Chad Wilkinson, RDA Deputy Executive Director
Jennifer Kennedy, Council Executive Director
G.L. Critchfield, City Attorney
Brooke Smith, City Recorder
Kim Sorensen, Mayor's Office
Erica Brown, Mayor's Office
Pattie Johnson, Council Office
Ryan Madsen, IT Department
Camron Kollman, IT Department
Russ Kakala, Public Works
Brenda Moore, Finance & Administration
Brett Youngs, Power Department
Elvon Farrell, Community & Economic Development
Aaron Ardmore, Community & Economic Development
Joey Mittelman, Fire Department
Joshua Schultz, Fire Department
Jeff Puls, Fire Department
Jed Finlinson, Fire Department
Scott White, Fire Department
Daren Wightman, Fire Department
Members of the Public (per sign-in sheet)

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Turner called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Cotter made a motion to approve minutes for August 18, 2026. Board Member Bullen seconded. A voice vote was taken with all in favor.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

DeLynn Barney spoke regarding the property at 4868 South Box Elder Street. He said he was initially concerned about smoke that could occur from a fire tower being built in this location. There was a temporary training structure located on the property previously that did create a nuisance. He spoke with Chief Mittelman who informed him it would be different type of facility that would not create an issue. He believes the form-based code allows for education and training facilities. He said Murray City needs well-trained firefighters. He supports the development of the property as a training facility. He feels that location is ideal so that firefighters are quickly able to respond to calls.

ACTION ITEM

Consider a resolution approving a letter to Salt Lake County terminating the property tax increment funds collection period for the East Vine Street Redevelopment Project Area

Elvon Farrell presented this agenda item requesting the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) consider a resolution approving a letter to Salt Lake County, terminating the property tax increment funds collection period for the East Vine Street Redevelopment Project Area. He said this is different than closing the project area. He provided some background and objectives for the project area plan. He said the primary objectives have been accomplished. Mr. Farrell said there is approximately \$140,000 left in the project area fund. Brenda Moore, Murray City finance director, suggested ending the collection period, so as not to accumulate any more funds without an identifiable need. The project area was scheduled to continue receiving funds until 2028. Sending an official letter to Salt Lake County will end the tax collection. This process does not dissolve the project area. If no use is found for the accumulated funds, staff will come before the board to close and dissolve the project area.

Board Member Hock asked what would happen if the board voted not to consider this request. Mr. Farrell said the funds aren't eligible for other uses and would have to be returned to the taxing entities.

Board Member Bullen asked if the funds could be transferred to other project areas. Mr. Farrell said no.

Board Member Hock made a motion to adopt the resolution approving a letter to Salt Lake County, terminating the property tax increment funds collection period for the East Vine Street Redevelopment Project area.

Seconded by Board Member Bullen.

Y Diane Turner
Y Paul Pickett
Y Pam Cotter
Y Adam Hock
Y Clark Bullen

Motion passes: 5-0

DISCUSSION ITEM

Potential future use of the RDA-owned property at 4868 South Box Elder Street for a Fire Department training facility

Chad Wilkinson introduced this agenda item. He provided a recap of this discussion item. He said this is a continuation of the discussion from the last meeting that was not finished, due to lack of time.

Mayor Hales addressed the Board regarding a proposed fire training tower adjacent to Fire Station 81. He requested the board's support for the project. He stated that the project would require a zoning change, which would be brought before the City Council at a future meeting. Mayor Hales stated the tower would allow firefighters to practice realistic emergency scenarios. He noted this preparation was critical to the safety of both firefighters and the public. He said the location next to the station would allow crews to train with their own equipment while remaining close to the community they serve. Mayor Hales stated the site was better suited to a public safety use than to residential development. He explained the fire station and surrounding industrial uses generated noise and activity at all hours, which could lead to complaints if homes were built nearby. He added that the site's history of soil contamination from the former refinery made a non-residential use more appropriate. Mayor Hales expressed his support for the project and asked for the board's support.

Chief Mittelman addressed the board regarding the proposed fire training tower. He said the facility could be designed to fit the character of downtown. He explained that training props would use propane with exhaust systems, and only non-hazardous training smoke would be used inside the structure. Chief Mittelman said he had met with the Mayor's Office, Community and Economic Development, Public Works, and Power to evaluate alternative sites. These included the Bullion Station, the Public Works site, and church properties. He stated that Power and Public Works needed additional land to support future growth in city services and could not give up those properties. He noted that the RDA site was approximately 0.74 acres, while other locations would require approximately two acres to accommodate the necessary supporting infrastructure. He explained that the site's access to 300 West and Vine Street, two major thoroughfares, allowed crews to reach the areas served by the City's other stations. He said the Bullion Station site would create response delays due to nearby schools and railroad tracks. He explained that without a local training facility, crews would need to be taken out of service to train elsewhere, leaving gaps in response coverage. He estimated the cost of maintaining coverage at approximately \$1.5 million annually for an additional crew, or at least \$500,000 annually in overtime. He also said the facility would serve as a noise buffer between the adjacent rail yard and downtown. He reported noise levels of approximately 110 decibels at the rail yard and 85 decibels at the edge of the property. He added that residential or business uses would be unlikely to tolerate those conditions, and the facility could become a positive attraction for downtown visitors. Chief Mittelman acknowledged the competing priorities before the board and requested its support for the project.

Board Member Bullen asked what addition infrastructure would be needed if another site was chosen. Chief Mittelman said they would need to have bathrooms, showers and space for logistical setup (bays and garages) that are already in place at Station 81.

Vice Chair Pickett said he is in favor of a training facility. He wonders if this property is the right choice. He believes the RDA is in full support of the chief having a training facility. He asks for clarification on the noise created by the training facility. Chief Mittleman said the training would typically be during business hours. If anything were planned after hours, he would communicate with neighbors. The noise level would be between 65 to 85 decibels.

Vice Chair Pickett expressed concern about noise exposure for the future high-density housing, located at the soccer field, south of the proposed facility property. Chief Mittleman said he doesn't believe the noise will increase for that housing. He said they can work on the design that will minimize the noise exposure.

The board and staff discussed the potential noise level and the impact it might have on housing. Mayor Hales said the current fire station already produces noise. He believes building the training facility at this property won't produce any more noise than there is already. Chief Mittleman said they try to work with neighbors near fire stations where they've held training and are willing to adapt to their requests for noise reduction. Vice Chair Pickett reiterated that he does support a training facility for firefighters, he wants to ensure the viewpoints of all citizens are represented before a decision is made.

Board Member Cotter said developers have not shown an interest in that property over the years, or the adjacent soccer field property, because of its environmental contamination. She doesn't believe developers want to deal with the clean-up needed in order to build housing. She said the training facility is needed for Murray and other cities' fire departments.

Chief Mittleman noted the other proposed sites for the training facility are adjacent to residential zoning, so the consideration is the same regardless of the site.

Board Member Bullen asked about the cost to build a training facility and if there are grants available to offset costs. Chief Mittleman has applied for the Assistance to Fire Fighters' Grant (AFG) of \$500,000. If other cities participate in using the facility, the grant could potentially increase to \$800,000. There is the requirement that the training tower be portable. He said costs without the grant range from \$500,000 to \$1.4 million. He said obtaining donations may be an option to lower costs.

Board Member Bullen asked if additional staff will be needed to lead the trainings. Chief Mittleman said it would be ideal to have additional staff, but they will do what's needed if that's not approved in future budgeting.

Mr. Wilkinson said the next steps include initiating a zone change request, to be presented to the City Council, after the request goes to the Planning Commission for approval. He said the board will also need to adopt a resolution changing the previous direction given to staff in 2023 to actively marketing the property.

UPDATE ITEM(S)

Update on the Old City Hall site

Mr. Farrell said the proposals for the old city hall site are due by September 24th. He said several developers have expressed an interest in submitting proposals. He said the committee will review

proposals to narrow down the selection to be submitted to the board. Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL) will be assisting with the analysis of proposals. Staff will present the findings to the board before proceeding with negotiations.

Update on future RDA project areas

Mr. Wilkinson said there isn't an update for this agenda item at this time.

Update on the Murray Chapel property renovation

Mr. Wilkinson said staff have reviewed building plans and are waiting for resubmittal by the property owner.

Board Member Bullen asked if the project is still on schedule. Mr. Wilkinson said it's becoming imperative for the property owner to provide the resubmittal of architectural plans. This would be the third review. They are still in the concept review stage. They need to have more action from the property owner to make the proposed deadlines.

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chad Wilkinson said staff will bring a resolution for the board's consideration for the property at 4868 South Box Elder Street to consider changing the direction given in 2023.

Board Member Cotter asked to provide updates on the Old City Hall site, future RDA project areas, and the Murray Chapel property renovation.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

The next scheduled meeting will be held on October 20, 2026 in the Murray City Council Chambers, 10 East 4800 South, Murray, Utah.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Turner adjourned the meeting at 6:26 p.m. MDT.

A recording of this meeting is available for viewing at <http://www.murray.utah.gov> or in the Community and Economic Development office located at 10 East 4800 South, Suite 260.

The public was able to view the meeting via the live stream at <http://www.murraycitylive.com> or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>. Anyone who wanted to make a comment on an agenda item was able to submit comments via email at rda@murray.utah.gov.

Chad Wilkinson, Deputy Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency
Community & Economic Development Department

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION ACKNOWLEDGING THE HOLDING OF AN AUTHORIZATION MEETING AS REQUIRED BY SUBSECTION 59-36-201(1) OF THE UTAH CODE AND, PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION 59-36-201(3), AND DIRECTING STAFF TO SUBMIT THE DISCLOSURE REQUIRED BY SUBSECTION 59-36-201(3) OF THE UTAH CODE BEFORE TRIGGERING TAX INCREMENT COLLECTION FOR THE ORE SAMPLING MILL PROJECT AREA.

WHEREAS, the RDA wants to request that the project area funds collection period for the Ore Sampling Mill Project Area begin; and

WHEREAS, beginning July 1, 2026, Subsection 59-36-201(1) of the Utah Code imposes the requirements that before the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City (RDA) may request that a project area funds collection period begin, the RDA must conduct a public meeting referred to as an authorization meeting and submit a disclosure described in Subsection 59-36-201(3) of the Utah Code; and

WHEREAS, for a minimum of 10 calendar days before the authorization meeting, proper notice of the authorization meeting was provided as a class A notice under Section 63G-30-102 of the Utah Code with a link to the RDA section of the City's website where an explanation of each item listed in Subsection 59-36-201(3) of the Utah Code may be found; and

WHEREAS, an authorization meeting was held on October 20, 2026 and the RDA Board addressed each item listed in Subsection 59-36-201(3); and

WHEREAS, the RDA Board wants to acknowledge the holding of an authorization meeting prior to requesting that the project area funds collection period begins for the Ore Sampling Mill Project Area.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City as follows:

1. It here by acknowledges holding an authorization meeting on October 20, 2026.

2. At the authorization meeting, the Redevelopment Agency Of Murray City Board of Directors addressed the following:

a. the requirement that a copy of the notice for and the minutes from the RDA's authorization meeting be sent to the program manager (defined as the association that represents at least two-thirds of the counties in the state);

b. the public good to be addressed through the use of tax increment, including a description of each project the RDA intends to pursue with the use of tax increment;

c. the type of tax increment sought for use;

d. the amount of tax increment that the RDA is authorized to use as a result of beginning the project area funds collection period:

(i) in total; and

(ii) separately for property tax increment and sales and use tax increment, if the TIF entity seeks to use more than one type of tax increment;

e. a cost analysis reflecting the administrative costs imposed on the state tax commission and the county to administer the collection, calculation, and distribution of the proposed tax increment;

f. a but-for analysis of each project the RDA intends to pursue with the use of tax increment; and

g. an explanation of how the benefit to residents or taxpayers near the project area is proportionate to the benefit to any party benefiting from the RDA's use of tax increment, as described in Section 59-36-202 of the Utah Code.

3. Staff is hereby authorized and directed to submit the required disclosure to the program manager within 30 days after October 20, 2026.

DATED this ____ day of October 2026.

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MURRAY CITY

Diane Turner, Chair

ATTEST:

Brooke Smith, City Recorder



Tax Increment Disclosure

Utah Code § 59-36-201

This disclosure is prepared in connection with the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City's ("Agency") intent to trigger property tax increment for the Ore Sampling Mill Community Reinvestment Area ("Project Area") in accordance with the Project Area Plan and Project Area Budget adopted in 2017. The Agency is not proposing an amendment to the adopted Project Area Plan or Project Area Budget. This disclosure is submitted for purposes of Utah Code Title 59, Chapter 36, Pre-increment Disclosure and Reporting.

Project Area and Existing Authorization

The Project Area was approved in 2017 as a 22.7-acre community reinvestment area. The adopted Project Area Plan identifies the redevelopment of blighted and deteriorating properties, environmental cleanup, infrastructure improvements, improved connections with public transit, job creation, expansion of the tax base, and promotion of new private development and investment as principal purposes of the Project Area.

The adopted Project Area Budget establishes a 2016 base taxable value of \$19,126,000 and a 20-year project area funds collection period. The Agency is authorized to receive 100% of the property tax increment from Salt Lake County, Murray City School District, Murray City, South Salt Lake Valley Mosquito Abatement District, and Central Utah Water Conservancy District. The Multi-County Assessing and Collecting Levy, County Assessing and Collecting Levy, and any other entity levies are not distributed to the Agency.

The maximum cumulative amount of tax increment the Agency is authorized to receive is 100% of the authorized increment generated over the 20-year collection period or \$8,000,000, whichever occurs first. The original Project Area Budget projected approximately \$5.2 million of property tax increment flowing to the Agency over the 20-year period.

Utah Code § 59-36-201(3)(a) – Authorization Meeting Notice and Minutes

Section 59-36-201(3)(a) requires the disclosure submitted to the program manager to include a copy of the notice for, and the minutes from, the Agency's authorization meeting.

[ATTACHMENT A – AUTHORIZATION MEETING NOTICE]

[ATTACHMENT B – AUTHORIZATION MEETING MINUTES]

Utah Code § 59-36-201(3)(b) – Public Good and Projects to Be Pursued

The public good to be addressed through the use of property tax increment is the implementation of the adopted Project Area Plan and Project Area Budget, including the elimination or reduction of blight, environmental remediation and site cleanup, redevelopment of aging and deteriorating properties,

Tax Increment Disclosure
Utah Code § 59-36-201

strengthening of the tax base, creation of employment opportunities, improvement of infrastructure, and promotion of private development and investment within the Project Area.

Consistent with the adopted Project Area Plan and Project Area Budget, projects and project-area activities that the Agency intends to pursue with tax increment include, as applicable: environmental remediation; cleanup of properties and sites; rehabilitation and improvement of existing infrastructure; construction of new infrastructure where necessary, including transportation, storm drain, sewer, water, and roadway improvements; transportation and public-transit connectivity improvements; beautification; land acquisition; adaptive reuse and redevelopment of blighted or deteriorated properties; developer and economic development incentives; and other activities authorized by and undertaken to implement the adopted Project Area Plan and Project Area Budget.

One existing project subject to a Participation Agreement is the redevelopment of the Ore Sampling Mill site as the Jesse Knight Entrepreneurial Center. The Participation Agreement contemplates a professional office building and entrepreneurial center with associated infrastructure, utilities, parking, and site improvements, together with environmental remediation and site preparation. The Agreement authorizes reimbursement of eligible site preparation and environmental remediation costs from available tax increment, subject to the Agreement's terms and a maximum reimbursable amount of \$2,500,000.

The identification of the foregoing project categories is intended to describe the uses of tax increment already authorized by the adopted Project Area Plan and Project Area Budget. It does not amend or expand the existing authorization.

Utah Code § 59-36-201(3)(c) – Type of Tax Increment Sought for Use

The Agency seeks to use property tax increment. The Agency is not seeking sales and use tax increment through this specified event.

Utah Code § 59-36-201(3)(d) – Amount of Tax Increment Authorized for Use

The Agency is triggering the Project Area in accordance with the authorization contained in the adopted Project Area Plan and Project Area Budget, without modification.

Existing Authorization	Amount / Term
Base taxable value	\$19,126,000 (2016 base year)
Type of increment	Property tax increment
Collection period	20 years
Authorized participation	100% from participating taxing entities identified in the adopted budget
Updated 2026 projected increment to Agency	\$5,556,265 nominal; \$3,684,871 present value at 4.00%
Maximum cumulative authorization	\$8,000,000 or 100% of authorized increment generated over 20 years, whichever occurs first

Utah Code § 59-36-201(3)(e) – Administrative Cost Analysis

The adopted Project Area financing structure accounts for administrative costs associated with the collection and administration of property tax increment. The Project Area Budget provides a 3% administrative allocation to the Agency. It also provides for a County administrative fee equal to 1% of the Salt Lake County contributed increment.

The County administrative fee is incorporated into the adopted Project Area Budget and the financing structure approved through the Taxing Entity Committee process. The Agency relies on that agreed structure as the cost allocation for County administration of the collection, calculation, and distribution of the Project Area's property tax increment.

The adopted Project Area Plan and Project Area Budget do not identify a separate State Tax Commission administrative charge attributable specifically to this Project Area. The Agency therefore has not identified an additional Commission administrative cost from the existing Project Area financing documents for inclusion in this analysis.

Utah Code § 59-36-201(3)(f) – But-For Analysis of Projects

The adopted Project Area Plan concluded that use of project area funds was necessary to incentivize and accelerate cleanup and redevelopment because of the blighted condition of properties in the Project Area, the longstanding deterioration of the Ore Sampling Mill site, and uncertainty and costs associated with potential environmental contamination. The adopted Plan states that increment is needed to pay for cleanup of the Ore Sampling site and to provide an incentive to promote redevelopment elsewhere in the Project Area.

The adopted public benefit analysis anticipated at least \$27.8 million of private investment and an increase in taxable value from \$19,126,000 to approximately \$46,926,000 at buildout. It compared that anticipated private investment with approximately \$5.2 million of projected public investment and identified a private-to-public investment ratio of approximately 5.3 to 1.

For the Jesse Knight Entrepreneurial Center project, the Participation Agreement further documents the but-for basis for assistance. The Agreement states that the purpose of the tax increment incentive is to encourage redevelopment of a functionally obsolete, blighted, and contaminated site and records the Participant's representation that redevelopment would not be economically feasible without the tax increment incentive. The Agreement limits the Agency's obligation to available tax increment and provides for reimbursement of eligible environmental remediation and site preparation costs, while the Participant remains responsible for financing the development and related improvements except as expressly provided.

For the additional project categories identified in § 59-36-201(3)(b) above, the adopted Project Area Plan identifies environmental contamination, blight, deteriorated or obsolete conditions, infrastructure needs, site-preparation costs, and redevelopment impediments as conditions the use of tax increment is intended to address. Tax increment would be used only where the applicable project is intended to overcome one or more of those impediments and produce the public benefits described above. Any project-specific assistance remains subject to the adopted Plan, Budget, applicable law, and any approvals or agreements required at that time.

Utah Code § 59-36-201(3)(g) and § 59-36-202 – Proportionate Benefit

The adopted Project Area Plan and Project Area Budget identify substantial public benefits from the use of tax increment. The Project Area was projected to increase taxable value by approximately \$27.8 million at buildout. The adopted analysis also anticipated job creation, increased property and other tax revenues, environmental cleanup, removal of blighted conditions, improved infrastructure, increased economic activity, and redevelopment that could catalyze additional private investment.

The adopted financing structure preserves the base-year property tax revenues for the taxing entities during the collection period. After the collection period ends, the incremental property tax revenues are no longer distributed to the Agency under the Project Area Budget.

Section 59-36-202 requires the Agency to prepare an estimate in present value, using an approximated discount rate, of (1) revenue allocated to any party in the form of tax increment, or bond financing secured by tax increment, for each year over the collection period or 40 years, whichever is greater, and (2) revenue expected to be received by each taxing entity for each year over 40 years.

§ 59-36-202 – 40-Year Present-Value Analysis

The Agency prepared an updated 40-year analysis using a 4.00% approximated discount rate, consistent with the discount rate used in the original Project Area financial model.

The analysis uses the established base taxable value of \$19,126,000; actual 2026 Project Area taxable value of \$49,362,500; 2026 tax rates and participation; and the existing Jesse Knight development assumptions of \$9,000,000 of initial modeled value plus \$4,000,000 of additional modeled development phased over five years on other additional projects. No additional appreciation, inflation, or speculative development is assumed. The detailed annual present-value schedule is attached to and incorporated into this disclosure.

[ATTACHMENT C – 2026 40-YEAR ANALYSIS]

Measure	Nominal Amount	Present Value / Treatment	Basis
Tax increment allocated to Agency	\$5,556,265 over Years 1-20	\$3,684,871 at 4.00%	2026 40-Year Analysis
Tax increment allocated to Agency, Years 21-40	\$0	\$0	20-year collection period ends
Taxing-entity revenue	Annual 40-year schedule attached	Annual amounts discounted to 2026 present value at 4.00%	2026 40-Year Analysis
Maximum cumulative authorization	\$8,000,000	Not reached under current projection	Adopted Project Area Budget

Under the updated analysis, nominal property tax increment allocated to the Agency over the 20-year collection period is projected at approximately \$5,556,265, with a present value of approximately \$3,684,871 using the 4.00% approximated discount rate. No tax increment is allocated to the Agency in

Tax Increment Disclosure
Utah Code § 59-36-201

years 21 through 40. The analysis separately presents, in present value, the amount of property tax revenue expected to be received by each taxing entity in each of the 40 years. These projections do not amend the adopted Project Area Budget or increase the Agency's existing \$8,000,000 maximum authorization.

The Agency concludes that the projected public benefits are proportionate to the benefits provided to parties receiving project assistance because the use of tax increment is limited to the authorized collection period and purposes, preserves base-year property tax revenues, addresses documented redevelopment impediments, supports environmental remediation and infrastructure improvements, and is intended to increase taxable value and return the full post-collection-period tax base to the taxing entities. Project-specific assistance remains limited by applicable agreements and approvals.

Supporting Documents

- Adopted Ore Sampling Mill Community Reinvestment Project Area Plan and Project Area Budget (2017).
- Jesse Knight Entrepreneurial Center Participation Agreement and First Amendment.
- 2026 40-Year Analysis, including the § 59-36-202 present-value estimates.

Ore Sampling Mill CRA – 2026 Trigger / 40-Year Analysis

MODEL INPUTS			
Base Year Real Taxable Value		\$17,856,908	
Base Year Personal Property Taxable Value		\$1,269,092	
Total Base Year Taxable Value		\$19,126,000	Adopted base
1/1 Collection Period (Years)		20	
Disclosure Analysis Period (Years)		40	New 40-year analysis
Trigger / Year 1		2026	Adopted planned trigger
Maximum Cumulative TIF Authorization		\$8,000,000	Adopted cap
Agency Administrative Allocation		3.0%	
Affordable Housing Allocation		20.0%	
County Fee on County TIF		1.0%	
Actual 2026 Project Area Taxable Value		\$49,363,500	
Initial Modeled Jesse Knight Project Value		\$9,000,000	
Total Additional Phased Jesse Knight Value		\$4,000,000	
Approximated Discount Rate		4.00%	Original Ore Sampling Mill model assumption
2026 TAXING ENTITIES, RATES, AND PARTICIPATION			
Taxing Entity	2026 Rate	Participation	Levy Rate
Salt Lake County	0.001349	100%	0.001349
Multi-County Assessing & Collecting Levy	0.000014	0%	0.000000
County Assessing & Collecting Levy	0.000160	0%	0.000000
Murray City School District	0.003732	100%	0.003732
State Basic School Levy	0.001351	0%	0.000000
Murray Charter School	0.000042	0%	0.000000
Murray City	0.001448	100%	0.001448
Murray Library	0.000286	0%	0.000000
South Salt Lake Valley Mosquito Abatement District	0.000010	100%	0.000010
Central Utah Water Conservancy District	0.000040	100%	0.000040
TOTAL	0.008792		0.006939

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

MODEL CHECKS	
Check	Result
Total 2026 tax rate	0.008792
Participating tax rate	0.006939
20-year Agency TIF ≤ \$8M cap	TRUE
Year 21-40 Agency TIF = \$0	TRUE
Projected 20-year Agency TIF	\$5,556,265
\$8.0M authorization reached?	FALSE

PRESENT VALUE PROPORTIONAL-BENEFIT ANALYSIS (4.00% DISCOUNT RATE)

Annual figures below discount each nominal year-end amount to 2026 present value using the 4.00% approximated discount rate carried forward from the original Ore Sampling Mill model. Nominal-dollar schedules above are retained for transparency.

PARENT VALUE OF TAX INCREMENT ALLOCATED TO AGENCY																																														
Taxing Entity	Rate	Participation	20-Year PV	40-Year PV	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041	2042	2043	2044	2045	2046	2047	2048	2049	2050	2051	2052	2053	2054	2055	2056	2057	2058	2059	2060	2061	2062	2063	2064	2065		
Salt Lake County	0.001349	100%	\$716,370	\$716,370	\$39,220	\$37,712	\$36,261	\$34,867	\$43,505	\$42,684	\$41,863	\$41,041	\$40,221	\$39,403	\$37,887	\$36,430	\$35,029	\$33,682	\$32,386	\$31,141	\$29,943	\$28,791	\$27,684	\$26,619	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Multicounty Assessing & Collecting Levy	0.000014	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
County Assessing & Collecting Levy	0.000160	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Murray City School District	0.003732	100%	\$1,981,833	\$1,981,833	\$108,503	\$104,329	\$100,317	\$96,458	\$120,355	\$118,086	\$115,813	\$113,540	\$111,271	\$109,008	\$104,815	\$100,784	\$96,908	\$93,181	\$89,597	\$86,151	\$82,837	\$79,651	\$76,588	\$73,642	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
State Basic School Levy	0.003151	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Murray Charter School	0.000042	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Murray City	0.001448	100%	\$768,943	\$768,943	\$42,099	\$40,479	\$38,922	\$37,425	\$46,993	\$45,817	\$44,935	\$44,053	\$43,173	\$42,295	\$40,668	\$39,104	\$37,600	\$36,154	\$34,763	\$33,426	\$32,140	\$30,904	\$29,716	\$28,573	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Murray Library	0.000286	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
South Salt Lake Valley Mosquito Abatement District	0.000010	100%	\$5,310	\$5,310	\$291	\$280	\$268	\$258	\$324	\$316	\$310	\$304	\$296	\$292	\$281	\$270	\$260	\$250	\$240	\$231	\$222	\$213	\$205	\$197	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Central Utah Water Conservancy District	0.000040	100%	\$212,415	\$212,415	\$11,629	\$11,182	\$10,752	\$10,339	\$12,900	\$12,657	\$12,413	\$12,169	\$11,926	\$11,684	\$11,434	\$10,802	\$10,387	\$9,987	\$9,603	\$9,234	\$8,879	\$8,537	\$8,209	\$7,893	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TOTAL	\$3,684,871		\$3,684,871	\$2,071,741	\$193,982	\$186,521	\$179,347	\$223,780	\$219,560	\$202,681	\$202,634	\$211,108	\$206,889	\$202,681	\$191,234	\$186,886	\$187,390	\$180,183	\$173,253	\$166,589	\$160,182	\$154,021	\$148,097	\$142,401	\$136,924	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[illegible]

RESOLUTION NO. R26-

A RESOLUTION OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MURRAY CITY ("RDA") DIRECTING STAFF TO CEASE ALL ACTIVITIES RELATING TO THE MARKETING AND SALE OF THE REAL PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT AT APPROXIMATELY 4868 SOUTH BOX ELDER STREET, MURRAY, UTAH.

WHEREAS, the RDA owns a certain parcel of real property located at approximately 4868 South Box Elder Street, Murray, Utah, further identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 21-12-230-045 (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to RDA Resolution Number R23-48, the Property was authorized for marketing and sale for private development; and

WHEREAS, changing community needs and strategic priorities have prompted a reconsideration of marketing the Property; and

WHEREAS, the RDA has explored an alternative use for the Property that may better serve the community that includes a fire department training facility; and

WHEREAS, the RDA believes it is in the best interest of the community to pursue the construction of the fire department training facility.

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

1. The Executive Director is hereby authorized to immediately cease all active marketing regarding the sale or development of the Property. Any active public listings related to the disposal of the Property shall be withdrawn effectively immediately.

2. The RDA Board of Directors finds that locating a fire department training facility on the Property is in the best interest of the health, safety, and welfare of the community.

3. The Executive Director is authorized to pursue construction of a fire department training facility on the Property.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City on this day of October 2026.

Redevelopment Agency of Murray City

Diane Turner Chair

ATTEST:

Brett A. Hales, Executive Director



**THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
OF MURRAY CITY**

TO: **Redevelopment Agency Board**

FROM: **Elvon Farrell, Economic Development Specialist**

MEETING DATE: **October 20, 2026**

RE: **Agenda Item #5 – Update on the Old City Hall site**

The Request for Proposals (RFP) for the redevelopment of the former Murray City Hall site closed on September 24, 2026. The RDA received four proposals from development teams interested in the approximately six-acre property.

The selection committee, along with JLL, the City's real estate consultant, is currently reviewing the proposals. The evaluation process includes consideration of the proposed development concepts, financial capacity, economic impact, commercial activation, requested public participation, and compatibility with the City's redevelopment objectives. Staff may request additional information or clarification from the development teams as part of this review.

Staff anticipates bringing a recommendation to the RDA Board for consideration and potential selection of a development partner at its November 17, 2026, meeting. If additional time is needed to complete the evaluation process, a special RDA Board meeting may be scheduled in early December.

Attachments:

1. None



**THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
OF MURRAY CITY**

TO: Redevelopment Agency Board

FROM: Elvon Farrell, Economic Development Specialist

MEETING DATE: October 20, 2026

RE: Agenda Item #6 – Update on future RDA project areas

There are no updates on future project areas at this time.

Attachments:

1. None



**THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
OF MURRAY CITY**

TO: Redevelopment Agency Board

FROM: Elvon Farrell, Economic Development Specialist

MEETING DATE: October 20, 2026

RE: Agenda Item #7 – Update on the Murray Chapel property renovation

Community and Economic Development staff met with the general contractor and architect for the Murray Chapel renovation project on September 29, 2026. The meeting focused on reviewing and discussing the Planning Division's previous comments regarding the proposed site plan and identifying items that need to be addressed as the project moves forward.

The next step is for the general contractor and architect to prepare and submit a formal site plan application for review and approval by the Planning Division. Staff will continue coordinating with the project team as the plans move through the City's review process.

Attachments:

1. None