

**MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, December 9, 2008, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Members in Attendance:

Krista Dunn	Council Chairman
Robert D. Robertson	Council Member
Jim Brass	Council Member

Member Participating Electronically:

Patricia W. Griffiths	Council Member
-----------------------	----------------

Member Excused:

Jeff Dredge	Council Member
-------------	----------------

Others in Attendance:

Daniel Snarr	Mayor
Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Michael D. Wagstaff	Council Executive Director
Janet M. Lopez	Council Administrative Secretary
Jan Wells	Mayor's Chief of Staff
Zachery Fountain	Mayor's Office
Blaine Haacke	General Manager, Power
Greg Bellon	Power Department
Pat Wilson	Finance Director
Erin McShay	Valley Journals
Tim Tingey	Community & Eco. Dev. Director
Carol Heales	City Recorder

Chairman Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance. Ms. Dunn announced that Pat Griffiths was participating by teleconference and that Jeff Dredge was excused, due to surgery earlier in the day.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Dunn called for a motion on the Committee of the Whole minutes from the meeting held on November 18, 2008. Ms. Griffiths moved approval. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion

and the motion carried 4-0.

It was decided to rearrange the order of business items until everyone was present for the power presentation.

Business Item: Open and Public Meeting Training - Frank Nakamura

Mr. Nakamura reminded those present that under Utah law the City Council is required to undergo training annually on the Utah Open and Public Meeting Act. Mr. Nakamura distributed a copy of the Utah Code addressing that topic. He stated this Council has not had any issues regarding the Open and Public Meetings Act. There have been no challenges. He submitted that the City exceeds the requirements of the Act and offered that all Council members attend the Utah League of Cities and Towns training twice a year. Some members of the Council have been on the Planning and Zoning Commission, therefore, they are extremely familiar with the requirements, and again, there have been no issues.

Mr. Robertson added that he has completed the same training at the State Records Committee Board meetings.

Mr. Nakamura confirmed that the Records Committee goes hand in hand with the Open and Public Meetings Act. As required by statute, Mr. Nakamura proceeded to go through the requirements. There is a declaration of public policy which is to “aid in the conduct of the people’s business. It is the intent of the Legislature that the state, its agencies, and its political subdivisions take their actions openly, and conduct their deliberations openly.” Murray has followed this underlying premise on regularly scheduled meetings and all retreats. The staff has been very careful in complying with the Act, both Mike Wagstaff and his predecessor, Shannon Jacobs, has made sure that happened.

The other part is the notice of meeting. Mr. Nakamura relayed instances in other entities where the agenda prepared is not specific. Murray’s agendas are very specific and reflect the resolution and what it is about. It is required to give 24 hours notice and the City gives much more than that minimum. In some instances we have given 24 hours notice, however in most instances it is well in advance. Notices go to the press, handled by Janet Lopez. There is a new requirement to post on the Utah State Public Notice website, by October 1, 2008. Although there is some leeway, until April 2009, we have been posting on the state website well before that deadline.

Mr. Nakamura commented that emergency meetings are allowed, however, the City has not had any. The final remaining issue is closed meetings and there have been few. The criterion of the closed meeting includes discussion of the character, professional competence, or physical and mental health of an individual. We are allowed to close a meeting for imminent litigation, and for strategy sessions regarding real estate transactions. When Murray has had a situation to

close a meeting, the statute has been followed, which requires a 2/3 vote to close; it has been included on the agenda, and the motion to go into a closed session has been made. Again, Mr. Nakamura stated that Murray has had no issues.

Minutes are required and we are very careful, ours are not verbatim, however, they are very close to that. We do have a recording of every meeting.

As we are using electronic participation, it is authorized under the Council Rules that have been adopted. The Director and others make sure that the City is complying with the statute.

Mr. Nakamura knows that this information is a review for the Council members, however, he wanted to make sure it is clear on the record. If someone wishes to bring up an item that has not been included on the agenda, the Council is very conscientious in stating that it cannot be discussed. The minutes reflect that. He feels that Murray does a good job.

Ms. Griffiths asked what constitutes a quorum. She had listened to training by David Church, of the League of Cities and Towns, and in one part of the presentation he said the Mayor, even though he does not have a vote, and two Council members are considered a quorum.

Mr. Nakamura responded that in some forms of government that is true, however, not in Murray's Mayor Council form of government. The mayor would not be counted. Three Council members would constitute a quorum. He added that Mr. Wagstaff and he had discussed this and it is two present Council members and participation electronically. There is an internal Council Rule which states that three Council members must be present and then someone can participate electronically. At some point the Council may want to address that, although, they had also decided, by following Robert's Rules of Order, the Council Chair could wave that rule. The mayor would not be counted as part of a quorum.

Ms. Griffiths confirmed that the mayor's vote would only apply in the other forms of municipal government.

Mr. Nakamura said that there are forms of government where the mayor sits as one member of the council. Others agreed that most of the Utah cities have that sort of government. Only five cities in the state have the Mayor Council form as Murray has.

Business Item: **Intermountain Power Project (IPP) Call Back -Blaine Haacke**

Mr. Haacke began with a quick history about IPP, where Murray has 72 megawatts (MW) of ownership, or 4% of the Delta, Utah plant. Of the 72 MW, Murray has called back 13 MW for the winter and will call back 25 MW in the summer. That leaves around 40 to 60 MW that are laid off back to California, and they are glad to take it, paying for all costs, including debt

service. This is the greatest agreement for excess power sales ever done in Utah back in 1978. They are required to take every kilowatt hour that comes out of the plant, if Utah does not want it. We have grown into the resource. It is a market range of \$50 to \$53 per MWh delivered. It is comparable to the Hunter plant and San Juan plant in the mid \$40 range. IPP is the City's next most economical resource. The resource is 24 hours a day, seven days a week, which is not always the best situation.

Within the last six months, due to the failure of the IPP 3 project, Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems (UAMPS) approached Murray Power with a proposition. Because many cities had hoped to add on energy to the existing plan with this project, when it was unable to be built, UAMPS began seeking additional energy for long term usage. It has approached Murray and Logan regarding excess energy from IPP. The negotiations would have Murray call back some of the 72 MW for the other UAMPS members to utilize. The excess energy would be sold at a premium to UAMPS and it will market and sell to the other members that need it.

There have been several meetings with UAMPS, involving the Mayor's office and the attorney's office, and the Power Advisory Board is aware of the negotiations. Mr. Haacke proceeded to outline some of the concerns that have surfaced. First, the needs of Murray residents are a priority, so the power department must not sell itself too short or too long on energy and have plenty to cover the necessary load of the City. Each season there is the opportunity to call back, either on a six month or eighteen month basis. The City is now in the midst of an eighteen month call back and by December 23 a new commitment must be made as to how much to call back. Murray will utilize part of the call back, however, anything on top of City usage can be sold.

Secondly, Murray wants to make sure to have coverage for any catastrophic problems that might take place. If the City is going 10 years out on a contract and suddenly something happened with one of the other resources, Murray needs the opportunity to call back the energy for its own use. Also, the 1978 contract with the California users is an ideal situation and Murray Power needs to make sure that no part of that agreement will be breached. For example, they may say that Murray has called back energy and sold at a margin, which is against the contract. UAMPS counsel and staff has studied the contract and feel that it is something that can be done without problems. The language must be tight. If Murray had to call back 72 MW on its own, that is something that could potentially bankrupt the City. It would be a \$15 to \$16 million expenditure a year. UAMPS has said it will take some of that from the City. If nothing is done, the City is fine until 2027 and maybe even beyond, as Murray may never grow into that usage.

The length of the term is another concern, according to Mr. Haacke. It is important to have flexibility. Whether the City should contract to 2027 or only out 10 years is a detail to determine. The power department would like to be able to call back the energy as needed.

Mr. Haacke explained that one UAMPS member has approached Murray to negotiate

outside of the UAMPS agreement. The problem, for some entities, is that with UAMPS, the energy must be prorated out to all members. This organization would like to make sure that its needs will be met up front. This could be pursued, however, the staff feels it is easier to go through UAMPS, and that there is some safety and wisdom in doing that.

Mr. Nakamura commented that it is important to maintain a good working relationship with all the cities and if negotiating is with UAMPS, it is the intermediary and should problems arise, then relationships are protected. The other issue is to comply with the IPP agreement. The interpretation is that if power is used within the UAMPS system as a whole, then it complies with the present contract. Additionally, when a called back is brokered to UAMPS then if they do not sell it, it is energy owned by UAMPS, not Murray. UAMPS will need to have a really good idea on the commitments of power it can sell. Mr. Haacke and Mr. Bellon will provide a schedule of the maximum amount of power retained for Murray. One of the main things in negotiation is to make sure that Murray will not be responsible for excess energy.

Mr. Brass pointed out that Murray is part of UAMPS and if there are overages, it is important that they not be prorated making Murray responsible for some expense due to the City's percent of the project pool in UAMPS.

Mr. Haacke responded that UAMPS is planning to have a signed agreement for sale prior to call back commitments. He told UAMPS that Murray would like to sell 30 MW in the summer and 40 during the winter, for a 10-year segment. If Murray has excess energy, summer or winter, then seasonal deals can be made with a similar margin. Small agreements have been made with eight other UAMPS members up to 2011. He noted that it was awkward to have eight different contracts to negotiate and he sees a great value in using UAMPS.

Mr. Nakamura indicated that if the price goes up, it is a disadvantage to Murray, however, with the UAMPS contract there is a guaranteed amount. The UAMPS members will benefit, because UAMPS will sell it to them for cost plus 6%. They will not increase the cost.

Mr. Haacke said that the recommendation was a 6% margin on top of all-in costs. It was necessary to define all-in costs because there may be some carbon costs coming in the future. There could be as much as \$20 to \$30 per MWh surcharge, due to the greenhouse gas issue. These will be part of the all-in costs, should they occur. This could be a \$75 resource in five to ten years and Murray will get 6% on top.

Another draft of the contract has just been received and Mr. Nakamura observed that there is still some tweaking necessary, before the contract is completed. December 23 is the deadline, when a commitment must be made. His request of the Council is the approval to continue to pursue this matter. The 6% was initially a \$3 surcharge, which will not be the same in 10 years as \$3 is in 2008. The 6% margin is a protection for the City.

Mr. Haacke suggested that, hypothetically, a 30 MW sale with a 6% surcharge for six months would bring about \$400,000 into the power department. The 40 MW sale would bring in about \$500,000, therefore, about a million dollars a year could go into reserves. This is sizeable income.

In summary, Mr. Haacke stated that it is important that the Murray citizens are covered, the California entities will not be upset, and that the UAMPS members will not be disturbed with the markup.

Mr. Brass added, that even with the markup the price is a bargain to UAMPS. Most of those looking for resources now, have discovered that it is about \$10 more than the IPP call back. He confirmed his delight with the idea of freeing the City from the potential of being responsible for the carbon tax. The expense of developing renewables to fill out the City portfolio can be off set by the additional \$400,000 per year. That protects the citizens, too.

Mr. Haacke said that would help the City pay for the carbon tax Murray would incur by calling back IPP for ourselves.

The American Public Power Association (APPA) is insisting that the carbon tax may be up to \$20 per MW, remarked Mr. Brass.

Mr. Bellon explained that Murray has given UAMPS an amount not to exceed 30 MW in the summer. It will be interesting to see how much they get to a subscription rate and they will only call back what they can subscribe. Eventually, the energy will probably be fully subscribed.

The City will not see this money until about 2011 or 2012 Mr. Haacke reminded the group. Because of the 18-month commitment with California users, Murray must make decisions now, which dictates planning for future needs.

Mr. Nakamura said that the three major points in negotiating still need some work and the issue of not being stuck with the brokered power will be clarified.

Mr. Haacke stated that the contract with the California entities is a wonderful deal. By 2027 the plant will be paid for in total. They will have paid for the mortgage and all associated costs.

Ms. Griffiths offered that the plan sounds very well thought out. She appreciated the staff work on this and confirmed that it does seem like a prudent thing to do.

Mr. Haacke thanked Ms. Griffiths and stated that he started casually marketing the idea about eighteen months ago and reported that Jim Matsumori commented on the value of Murray's ownership in IPP.

Mr. Brass asked about the unit rebuilds. He indicated that Units #1 and #2 are being rewound in 2011 and the outages will be one month, first quarter, and three months, fourth quarter, respectively. He asked how that will affect Murray and if there will be enough power to cover the outages.

Mayor Snarr stated that the bonds on Hunter #2 will be retired in 2011. That will be \$2.4 million in interest savings every year on the City portion of the plant. There are the gas turbines that can be utilized.

Mr. Haacke said that the last rebuild of IPP cost Murray \$70 power for replacement energy charges, rather than \$50 power, and Murray paid for the rebuild. He confirmed that the City can develop a plan of action not to call back any power at that time. Thus, causing Californians to pay for the rebuild. It becomes the higher cost of energy and the cost of the rebuild.

Business Item: **State Lobbyist Discussion**

Ms. Dunn explained that this is a continuation of a previous discussion on whether the City will decide to engage the services of a lobbyist for the upcoming legislative session. Mayor Snarr gave his comments earlier and Ms. Dunn would like the Council Members to offer their opinions at this time. She stated that if a lobbyist is hired, then it should be done fairly quickly. She pointed out that Mr. Dredge had sent his comments by email to all Council Members and asked that they be entered into the minutes.

Ms. Griffiths asked that Mr. Dredge's comments be summarized and also that the last meeting discussion be fundamentally expressed, as she was not present, due to her recent surgery.

Ms. Dunn said that Mayor Snarr commented that the legislators representing Murray City do a great job for Murray and the staff and elected officials have exemplary communication with them and they represent the City well. The Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) represents us well and lobbies for us in general municipal needs across the state. His feelings were that he would rather the City not go in that direction.

Mayor Snarr added that with the economic situation he did not feel there would be a lot of money to be given out.

Ms. Dunn read Mr. Dredge's email into the minutes, as follows:

In a false sense of bravado I thought after my surgery today I might try and make it to the Committee of the Whole meeting this evening. It was at my suggestion at the last COW to move the discussion to our next meeting so that we could more fully discuss the merits of hiring a lobbyist. I therefore

feel bad that I probably will not be able to attend either in person or by phone. For that I apologize.

Unfortunately, I have not heard from staff all of their concerns regarding hiring a lobbyist. I have spoken with enough of you to get a general flavor of the reasons for staff's opposition, but as I respect Jan's experience and perspective I would have liked to have participated in the full discussion this evening. With that being said, I feel that it is important for me to weigh in and express my position on this issue based on my own thoughts, research, meeting with the lobbyist in question, and talking to others in government who have dealt with lobbyists.

Almost unanimously those in city government I spoke with were initially opposed to the idea of using a lobbyist. However, all that I spoke to were, in the end, happy with the results. The overriding belief was that lobbyists, whether you love them or hate them, have access to people and the decision making processes that most of us just don't have. Secondly, there was expressed a feeling that good coordination and communication with a lobbyist allowed for a more effective coverage of those individuals who are involved in the decision making process. I would express this as effectively "dividing and conquering".

In a tight economy I would suspect that most of you would expect that as a CPA my inclination would be to pull back and not want to spend the money. Don't get me wrong, I am concerned about cash flow. However, it is exactly in these types of situations where money is tight that we need to pull out the stops and invest in our future. We need to aggressively go after monies and policies (especially in the area of transportation) that will allow us to proactively work on our infrastructure. I believe that someone who makes his living by being part of that process will help set the groundwork for returns on that investment possibly now, and for sure in the future.

I think the biggest question for me was the quality of the person we are investing in. Having no experience in this world I really had no idea what fees were, and what types of individuals were available to work with. After meeting with Mr. Stewart and asking around about the quality of his work I am enthusiastic about the possibility of working with him. By my own observations and from recommendations of others I have spoken to about him, he appears to be quite capable of doing a good job for us. He appears to be knowledgeable, well spoken, and have good connections at the legislature. I have been told that he specializes in acquiring funds for road projects. He also appears to have the bearing, demeanor, attitude, and

reputation of someone who will represent Murray with integrity.

I say we invest in a more proactive (towards funding) approach to our dealings with the Legislature and give a lobbyist a shot. Key to this relationship will be a well defined plan with well defined goals and channels of communication. I would highly suggest that Jan be heavily involved in this process. I would like to reiterate that my position on this in no way indicates that Jan or anyone in the Mayor's office currently or in the past has done anything other than stellar work. I simply believe this is a different type of work and would like to give it a try.

Ms. Dunn asked the other Council Members for their comments.

Ms. Griffiths stated her concern involves the timing with the economic status in the world, state, nation, and county. Because the rest of the City is participating in a hiring freeze, postponement of projects, and things of that nature, she feels the Council needs to conform with that. She agreed that there are values and benefits with a lobbyist and she stated her agreement with many of Mr. Dredge's comments, however, the timing is her concern. She also asked about specifically targeting projects for lobbying efforts or will it be general in nature.

Ms. Dunn responded that everyone agreed that a specific project must be identified. What has been suggested is targeting the one million dollars offered and then pulled back due to the state's inability to bond. This is the project most people feel the City should put its effort behind.

Ms. Griffiths responded that it is her understanding that state projects have been put on hold and that an additional gasoline tax is being suggested. She feels it is a gamble and that the City may spend \$25,000 and get \$50,000 in return which would be sufficient, however, she is not familiar with the lobbyist suggested by Mr. Dredge and wants to make sure that our needs are compatible with the other entities the lobbyist represents.

Ms. Dunn said that the person Mr. Dredge referred to is Dave Stewart who has been representing West Valley City, and is negotiating with Salt Lake City. These are the only municipalities he represents and he does not work for the county. As mentioned, if someone is hired, it would need to be a person with no conflict between agencies. Mr. Stewart has been recommended to the City and some Council Members have had an opportunity to meet with him. Mr. Dredge, Mr. Brass and Ms. Dunn have met with him and comments from Mr. Dredge were based on that meeting.

Mr. Brass said that he thinks the City does a great job at the capital and Murray legislators know more about Murray's needs than other cities they might represent. City representatives, Ms. Wells and Mr. Fountain, and legislators do a good job. His concern is that the ULCT loyalty is

occasionally conflicting in its representation and lobbying. In budget straining times, cities will be looking for other revenue, and, although, deals were discussed and made in the past, if sales tax redistributions were brought up again, there are 200 members of the League that favor redistribution and 12 who do not. This is just reality, not speaking against the League. They must go with the majority. This is where Mr. Brass feels Murray could use someone to help the City. Mr. Brass does feel that specific projects must be identified and the million dollars in road money is one, if the money is going to be available. Ironically, because times are difficult, this is the time to hire a lobbyist. Money will be handed out and it will be more difficult to get your share. It is a competitive environment and the more people working for Murray, the better off the City will be. Mr. Brass said that he did meet with Mr. Stewart, and although he is not comfortable with lobbyists, he does have a great reputation, as does Murray. For specific projects, now is the time to give it a try. There are some questions, one, where, in the budget, will the money come from. Second, who will the lobbyist report to? He would like to work closely with Ms. Wells and the Mayor's office and his desire is to maintain the relationship that has been developed. He thinks this should enhance what the City is trying to do.

Ms. Wells stated that past lobbyist experiences have been mixed in success. The City does have a number of people experienced which is favorable. She thinks Murray is well thought of at the legislature, however, being small, there is capital, but a limited amount. One concern is that a lobbyist takes the City's capital when they are asked to represent us. She asks if everyone is willing to give them the City capital. She feels a lobbyist can get something. She does not know Mr. Stewart, however, she feels there are other lobbyists that could be considered. They all have a list of attachments, with pros and cons. She stated that relationships are key and with a changing legislature, she is unsure of Mr. Stewart's strengths with the new leadership at the legislature. In addition, there is concern about managing a lobbyist and how it should be handled. She does not want to give up the team ship between the executive office and the council. Where the money will come from is another matter to consider. Ms. Wells said that she spoke with John Njord, casually, about the million dollars in question. He did not offer a lot of hope regarding transportation money. She would like to see if these issues can be discussed and answers found.

Ms. Griffiths said that she had not seen the memos by Mr. Wagstaff and Ms. Wells, however, the expertise within the City has built the reputation that Murray enjoys on the Hill and she feels the City should capitalize on those skills and be cautious with whom we associate to maintain and enhance the City. To be effective, it is important to impact and influence other legislators, besides our own, to achieve desired results.

Mr. Robertson voiced his concern of where the money will come from for a lobbyist and the issue regarding the oversight of lobbyist activities. It is important that a lobbyist go the direction the City wants and that relationships not be destroyed that have been built over the years.

Ms. Dunn commented that the last lobbyist hired by the City was not a good experience

and Ms. Wells and Ms. Dunn were in every meeting when the lobbyist was not. It is a top priority for this person to be in meetings and not just using the telephone. Also important, is not to spend this money and then have City personnel do the work. She feels it is important for one person to handle oversight of the lobbyist and as long as everyone present is in unison on the expectations, then who the lobbyist reports to is not important to her, either Ms. Wells, Mr. Fountain, or Mr. Wagstaff, would be fine.

Ms. Dunn continued discussing the source of the funding for this project. Money is not available in the interdepartmental fund, as was used last time. Her suggestion is that if the City is pushing for transportation funding, then that is the budget to use for lobbyist expenses. There is money in projects that were postponed, and money in Class C road funding. Ms. Dunn stated that looking at the budget does raise concerns.

Mr. Robertson asked how much is necessary for hiring a lobbyist.

Mr. Wagstaff said that the cost would be between \$25,000 and \$30,000.

Ms. Dunn talked with people from West Valley City and Salt Lake City who have been very pleased with the lobbyist results they have experienced. She suggests the City go very hard after the million dollars that have been lost, if it is decided to go forward. She admitted there are no guarantees.

Mayor Snarr commented that there was a package of items approved by the legislature including the million dollars for Cottonwood Street. His concern is that items from that list might be picked out for funding this year.

Ms. Wells stated that the total package was \$38 million. She feels it is very unlikely that many items will be picked up again.

Midvale had a million dollars that was a deal for Senator Walker, explained Mr. Wagstaff. Because she is no longer in the Senate, he wonders if Midvale will get that money. There was another million provided for by Councilman Wilde and Speaker Curtis, who are no longer there. Those two entities may be left hanging and now would be a good time to consider a representative for Murray who could possibly get some of those funds.

Mr. Fountain said that the plans are to cut \$500 million from the state's base budget. This is conservative. At the legislature, people are realizing that education is not safe, nor is health and human services. He has not seen bidding wars in the back room, as in the past. It is a completely new dynamic. The focus areas are Davis County and southern Utah, because that is where the power exists in leadership.

Ms. Wells added that the job of lobbyists is to get things for people. She thinks that we

would get something, and it may come with strings, or it may not be exactly what is asked for. Also, it is expected that this would be a continuing relationship, not a one time commitment, and the price increases as prizes are brought back.

Mayor Snarr does not want to see the City sour its good relationship because there is someone pressuring for money for Murray. He does not want to be pitted against West Valley City; what is right for the entire county should be done, and it is a sad state that people can be bought in American politics. He is not happy about how lobbyists work, because it is about special favoritism and then funding someone's campaign. He appreciates the Murray Council and does not want this issue to drive a wedge between City officials. He said it is Council decision and he wants to all be working in the same direction, should it be decided to hire the lobbyist.

Ms. Dunn suggest that since all officials have voiced an opinion, then it should be decided whether to move the issue forward.

Mr. Nakamura said that it can be decided here whether the matter comes before the Council meeting as an agenda item to be voted upon.

Ms. Dunn asked how everyone stands, in a straw poll. Ms. Griffiths said nay and Mr. Robertson, nay. Mr. Brass said aye, to making it an action item, however, he would like to see where the money would come from. Then he will be prepared to make a decision.

Ms. Wells reviewed that in road money, there were four small projects left in the budget to discuss at midyear. One issue is that the planned road projects provide work for the City crews and that must also be considered.

Mr. Brass pointed out there are ramifications to shifting money in the budget, and that must be discussed.

Mayor Snarr said that the crews do need to be kept busy, because the City needs them in the winter to plow snow.

Mr. Brass did commit to talking more about it, and moving the matter forward to the Council meeting.

Ms. Dunn noted that according to Mr. Dredge's email, read into the minutes, he will be a yes vote.

Ms. Dunn asked about the process and what it means to move forward for further discussion, how it would work.

Mr. Nakamura pointed out that if it is an executive function, through the Mayor's office,

then it is a funding issue for the Council. It could be a Council headed up decision for hiring and funding. As an executive function, as other projects are, then procedurally the approach is different. It may be more than just funding, such as entering into an agreement with someone, and other details.

Mr. Brass expanded on his viewpoint. His concern is who manages the lobbyist and the funding for it. Also, he asked if the lobbyist will be the person who has been discussed. He said he thinks it is worth a try in the end. There must be an agreement that everyone concurs on.

The Mayor asked if he is willing to look at the road projects to see the condition so that one can be eliminated. He stated his responsibility to the citizens who ask to be taken care of.

Ms. Griffiths observed that the public perception is important, and, also, the perception of the employees, at this time when projects and hiring has been eliminated.

Mr. Nakamura explained that approval from the Council is not necessary to move something to an agenda item. Anyone can have something added to an agenda.

Ms. Dunn declared that she would not want to spend time on lobby efforts if it was not the desire of the Council Members in general.

Mr. Nakamura said that he hears some say they want to talk about it. As the process goes, the budget issue is a separate agenda matter. Transferring money from one department to another or internally is an agenda item. It is up to the Council to decide what it will look like to go before the public to make a decision.

Ms. Dunn asked Mr. Brass if he would like to see it on an agenda or if he wants further discussion with answers about how it would be handled. She said her preference is for Ms. Wells to take control of the lobbyist, and for the funding to come out of road projects. Ms. Dunn does not want to go into another separate discussion. She said that extra money is in Class C road funds and she would like to use that.

Mr. Robertson said that it must be an agenda item. He reversed his vote to get it onto an agenda and decided upon one way or another.

Mr. Nakamura advised that it is not necessary to address both the decision for a lobbyist and the funding together, however, it might as well be decided upon at the same time.

Ms. Dunn votes to move it forward to an agenda.

Ms. Griffiths said that she thinks it will be good for Mr. Dredge to have benefit of the discussion that has taken place.

Ms. Dunn stated that she would like Ms. Wells to head the project, take part in the decision of who is hired, and be responsible for oversight.

Ms. Griffiths asked for safeguards to be built into the contract so the past experience would not be repeated.

In closing, Ms. Dunn remarked that the Council Open House held that afternoon, was a great success, she acknowledged the work that went into it and complimented the staff who did a great job. She and Mr. Brass greeted many employees. In addition, Ms. Dunn thanked all the employees present and expressed that everyone makes their jobs so much easier. She stated her appreciation for all Murray employees and the fact that there is no greater city to work for.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:26 p.m.

Janet M. Lopez
Administrative Secretary