



MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, June 7, 2011, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

Members in Attendance:

Jim Brass	Council Chair
Jeff Dredge	Council Vice Chair
Darren V. Stam	Council Member
Jared A. Shaver	Council Member
Krista K. Dunn	Council Member

Others in Attendance:

Michael D. Wagstaff	Council Executive Director
Dan Snarr	Mayor
Jan Wells	Mayor's Chief of Staff
Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Janet M. Lopez	Council Office
Peri Kinder	Valley Journals
Jennifer Brass	Citizen
Tim Tingey	Comm & Econ Dev Director
Dave Carpenter	MIS
Pat Wilson	Finance Director
Janie Richardson	MIS
Doug Hill	Public Services Director
Mike Terry	Human Resource Director
Craig Burnett	Assistant Police Chief
Christine Richman	Richman & Associates
Orden Yost	Citizen
Ken White	Power
Greg Bellon	Power
Nathan Lord	Citizen
Brenda Moore	Finance
Jill Carter	Human Resource Consultant

Chairman Brass called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 5:15 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.

Business Item #1:

Fee Increase Report – Christine Richman

Ms. Richman was asked to review the proposed fee increases that were recommended by the employee committee for several departments within the City. She analyzed fees in Community and Economic Development, Engineering for street improvements, Building Department for permits and the Parks Department for preparation of fields.

Community and Economic Development

Ms. Richman looked at variance requests, conditional use permits, condo conversion, certificate of appropriateness, flag lots, PUD reviews, subdivisions and lot line adjustments. Some other fees had recently been raised; therefore, they did not require a review. To determine the costs incurred by the City to process these applications, Ms. Richman met with the planning department to calculate the time spent on an average application of this type. She also considered how many applications of this type the City has processed over the last five years. These five years would include years when the planning department was quite busy, and also, years after the recession when things slowed considerably, giving a realistic average. Then she looked at costs related to personnel, and ancillary costs directly related to each of the planners, the director, and planning technicians and applied those costs to each of the application types to come up with a direct expense per application. Additionally, there are some overhead costs not directly related to processing applications and those were distributed to each application type based on their percentage of all applications processed. This gave a fully loaded cost of processing each type of application. This is an average cost over five years.

Ms. Dunn asked if these costs were compared to other cities fees. Ms. Richman responded that the employee committee did that, however, because she does work with other cities, she knows these fees are not out of line. She explained that Draper charges a subdivision fee of \$2,000.

The end result of applying the different costs to the different types of applications showed that there was only one proposed fee change that was excessive. The actual cost was slightly lower than the proposed fee. The rest of the proposed fee increases were lower than the actual cost of processing.

The new subdivision of three or more lots was the fee that was a little lower than the actual expense. The actual cost of processing a new subdivision of any size was about \$500, which is the current cost, plus \$50 per lot. She recommends that that fee stay as it is presently set, however, on a subdivision of 2 lots she recommends increasing to \$450 because the cost of processing justifies that higher amount. (That fee is not included on the sheet that was distributed to Council members.)

Ms. Richman noted that the study report shows the details of the actual costs, proposed fee increase and recommended fee increase.

Engineering

This is the fee that the city charges residents for going in to replace sidewalk, curb and gutter. The average cost for each of these projects is about \$1,200. The current fee is very low, and the proposed fee is \$25. The purpose of this project is to eliminate tripping hazards and keep curb, gutter and sidewalk in good shape, rather than trying to recoup more of the average costs and encourage residents to continue to take advantage of the program. The recommended fee is kept at the proposed fee of \$25.

Building Permit

The proposal from the fee committee was to increase the valuation schedule on which building permits are calculated by 15%. The valuation schedule for plumbing, electrical and heating permits are based on 1997 dollars, when the fee schedule was first established through the International Conference of Building Officials. She brought the 1997 dollars into 2010 dollars using the all urban consumers price index (CPI). When adjusted, the fees are considerably higher than the 15% amounts being proposed for Murray City. This does justify the fees given the change in the value of the dollar and valuation of the different building materials. The schedule on which the overall building permit is based is called Schedule 1. That is adjusted annually based on factors provided by the International Council of Building Officials. Therefore, that schedule was not adjusted in the same way and she does not recommended increasing those fees by 15% because that schedule already goes through a process of adjusting annually by what building materials cost in the community.

The other thing Ms. Richman has done with building permit fees is to look at the cost of an hour. This was completed on plan review and building inspection. This is the direct salary and benefit cost of plans examiners and building inspectors, as well as, training and other related costs. She did not apply the indirect expenses for the department director or other administrative costs. It is a conservative approach. The final calculation was \$80 per hour for plans examining and \$68 for building inspection. The current minimum fee for building inspection activities is \$30, which clearly does not cover the cost of sending employees out to complete an inspection. Ms. Richman recommends that a minimum charge for furnace replacement or other permit go from \$30.30 to \$50.50 (the 50 cents is the state surcharge). If someone wants a permit for two or three items, then she recommends a charge of \$50 for the first item and then \$10 for each additional item. Then you add the 10% surcharge for the state.

Mr. Shaver asked if there were a time limit on several items. Mr. Hill responded that is usually not a factor and all items are covered on one permit and inspected at the same time.

Ms. Dunn asked how Murray compares with other municipalities with these increases. Ms. Richman stated that most cities do use the International Council of Building Officials schedules with adjustments. The valuations are pretty consistent. The minimum fee amount for Murray is low in comparison to other jurisdictions. The current fee is quite low. The recommended brings Murray into a better range. Cities use a particular band for valuation so it is not often easy to compare fees.

As an example of how the fees play out – a manufactured home that is about a one hour plan review on foundation and tie downs and a one hour inspection costs the City about \$150 and the new fee will be about \$150. An afterhour's inspection, paying the building inspector overtime, with a two hour minimum, would cost the City about \$204, and the new adjusted minimum fee would be about \$150. This is better; however, the City still does not recoup the full amount. It is actually doubled for two hours. A reinspection would be \$50. Ms. Richman explained the average minimum charge. She indicated that Murray has kept these fees low to encourage people to actually pull their permits rather than doing the work without permits. This is greatly simplified for that purpose. She feels about the same amount of revenue will be generated.

Parks and Recreation

Ms. Richman expressed that the recommendation from the fee committee was to start charging a per participant fee of \$5 for field preparation in sports activities on recreation fields, soccer, baseball, etc. The City currently prepares the fields on a regular basis all through the summer with no charges to outside groups. This applies to anyone not affiliated with the Parks and Recreation department organized sports. The recommendation is to begin to charge to recoup the expense for that preparation. The study looked at the costs per game.

Ms. Richman stated that Mr. Hill had taken this information to the Recreation Board and they discussed the proposed fees. Mr. Hill related that the Board felt it would not be fair to charge Murray Max Soccer program (outside team) and not charge a fee to the program run by the City. They recommended that if a fee is going to be charged it should be charged to everyone who uses the fields, city/non-city and resident/non-resident. The staff took the report, broke down the costs and spread them among all those participants. It uses the same assumptions and formulas as Ms. Richman, but spreading out the fees would make them much lower. Mr. Hill said that the proposed fees would be presented to the Parks Board the next evening. They also included gym use in the numbers because of the cost to maintain the gym surface every year.

The proposal includes four categories:

- Baseball for Ken Price and Willow Pond Park with an actual cost of about \$78 per participant for the year. This is unaffordable for the leagues; therefore, the proposal is to charge \$10.
- Younger players (Liberty League) will be charged \$6 per player.
- Soccer and Lacrosse players will be charged \$3 per player.
- Gym use, volleyball and basketball, \$2 per participant.

The participant fee is recommended by staff, not only because it is easier to administer, but that it is based on Ms. Richman's report. The fee committee was estimating revenue at about \$7,500; however, this method will generate about \$30,000 of new revenue because everyone will be included in the new fees.

Mr. Shaver asked if there were a distinction between baseball fields, which the City owns, and soccer fields, which are owned by the school district. Mr. Hill stated that is correct, although, the City does stripe the fields. Watering, mowing and fertilizing the fields are not included in the costs. Direct costs are included. Ms. Richman noted that soccer fields are done every two weeks, whereas, baseball fields are done every day there is a game.

Mr. Stam asked if donations to upkeep had been taken into consideration. He said that soccer leagues had already donated \$1,000 for paint. Mr. Hill said he would work with them, and if the donation covers the cost of the fee, then they would not be charged additionally. Mr. Stam detailed some upkeep that Liberty League had already completed and Babe Ruth had purchased new batting cages. He said his concern is that with an extra assessment, they will no longer complete any volunteer maintenance. In reality there will be a different impact. As a City, Murray has a history of supporting youth programs to keep kids involved. With increased fees, they may have to eliminate sponsorships for low income individuals, meaning that those troubled kids, who need to be involved, may not play in the future. They could be participating in

activities, graffiti, for example, that could cost the City more money. His next question was regarding the funds collected. He asked if the funds would go into the general fund or back directly to maintaining and improving the fields. He asked that everyone consider what this fee will do to public relations with the volunteers who run these programs. If a league, such as Liberty League, decides that it cannot provide the program due to fees, the City may have to step up and provide that program at additional expense to the recreation department. He feels this could happen, leaving the City a huge expense to operate these sports programs that were run completely by volunteers. He also mentioned that Murray City is known for doing things differently than other cities. This makes us more like other cities. What if someone wants to walk the park? Are we going to put up a toll booth for everyone who wants to use the park? This is another user fee.

Ms. Dunn stated that she agreed in a lot of ways, however, she said that the City must weigh out the costs, as prices continually increase, and what costs the City has everyone pay for versus what the actual users cover. She would like to have everyone involved. The cost is going up to run the programs and a balance needs to be found. The City cannot continue to charge the same amount with the budget the way it is.

Mr. Stam said that Babe Ruth paid \$85 to play baseball seven years ago. Today the fees are \$150 and they are using the same uniforms. With new uniforms that cost would increase to over \$200 per participant.

Citizen, Orden Yost, commented that Murray Max has been using Murray fields since 1996 as an organization. They feel fortunate because the maintenance costs have not been very much. He said that his group is willing to pay the fee and contribute this toward the City expense. The league cannot participate without fields, he remarked. With over 300 players they will be willing to continue to try to repair and maintain the fields. The costs for everything in Murray are cheaper than other places. A baseball league outside of Murray is paying huge amounts of money. To play on a soccer program outside Murray is about \$1,000. Murray charges about \$250 per season to participate. It is inexpensive compared to other cities. We will continue to be different in that we are community based. He recommends that the City go ahead and raise fees as proposed. He knows there will not be a big difference in the condition of the fields and facilities, as this just offsets current costs. He loves the opportunity to work with the City and the school district to continue the program. He does not feel these fees will infringe upon the relationship they have with the City. As a small group, he feels this is appropriate.

Ms. Dunn does not feel the fees will impact many kids. For those that need fee waivers, the City needs to help. Mr. Yost stated that there are 30 to 40 players whose fees are covered by the league.

Ms. Richman stated that to wrap up the discussion, the charges are supported by the cost analysis that was completed. The fees proposed will not collect 100% of the direct costs, and do not include the capital costs, field maintenance and lighting. This does include weekly staff time and minor equipment required. It was pointed out that the fee increases are proposed by the fee committee.

Mr. Brass commented that this meeting is informational only; no decision will be made at this meeting. He thanked Mr. Yost for his comments and welcomes other users to give their opinions.

Mr. Nakamura stated that there was one legislative matter; however, the fee increases will be decided by the Mayor. One is part of the budget.

Business Item #2

Reorganization Presentation – Jill Carter

Ms. Carter said that she had met with the department heads and made a few minor changes from that meeting. She prepared a power point presentation with a slide for each department. There are no names on the positions. She was given some parameters up front to cut costs, increase efficiency, and consider the best interests of the community and Murray citizens without affecting the moral of the employees. She has worked hard to take input from the department heads and work with them and the administration. The team has consisted of herself, Mike Terry, Jan Wells, and the Mayor with input from the departments. She thanked everyone for their input and stated that her job ultimately was to challenge input to make sure that it made sense and change it where it did not.

Administrative and Development Services Department

There will be six divisions under Administrative and Development Services.

Beginning with the ***Information Technology Division***, it will consist of a Network Administrator supervising Network Technicians with one in Fire and one in Police. The intent is that these positions will be supervised by the Network Administrator. It is helpful to bring them all under one umbrella to assist the City, learn other departments and cross train. It is beneficial to the employees and City. There will also be a Senior Programmer and another Programmer reporting to that person.

The ***Geographic Information System Division*** will have a GIS Supervisor (vacant), GIS Administrator, and three GIS Analysts (one vacancy).

The ***Recorder Division*** has the Recorder, which is vacant and will be posted. She commented that any vacant position, for the most part, will be posted. About 99.9% will be posted. Ms. Wells corrected that statement, commenting that there are several appointed positions. The Recorder is an appointed position. Also included is the Purchasing Agent/Deputy Recorder, who will supervise the Records Supervisor and Facilities Work Coordinator, with a dotted line from the Recorder.

The ***Treasurer Division*** will have a Treasurer/Customer Service Manager, which is vacant, due to Ron Koller's retirement. The Customer Service Supervisor will supervise the existing structure of Customer Service and Billing. Three Meter Readers will also be supervised by the Treasurer/Customer Service Manager. This position will be an appointment, but will probably be open, Ms. Wells added.

The ***Building Inspection Division*** is included under Administrative and Development Services (ADS). The City will have the Chief Building Official, Plans Examiners and three Inspector 3 positions. Support staff will be an Office Administrator III, Office Administrator Supervisor and an Office Administrator II.

Finally, there is the ***Community & Economic Development Division*** with the Division Manager being vacant. Other positions in the division include a Senior Planner, Community Development Planner, Associate Planner, Zoning and Enforcement Officer, Community Development Block Grant Coordinator, two Business License Specialists and an Office Administrator II (vacant).

That is probably the largest change in City organization. At the top you have the Director of Administrative and Development Services and an Office Administrative III position. The RDA Board is connected with a dotted line to the ADS Director.

City Attorney's Department

The City Attorney has a direct relationship reporting to the Mayor with a dotted line to the City Council. Then there is the Deputy City Attorney who will be supervising two Legal Administrator II positions (one vacant), and two Legal Administrator I positions (one vacant). He will fulfill the Chief Prosecutor function and supervise the two Assistant City Prosecutors.

Not a retiree, but with Jen Francis resigning, the City Attorney has chosen not to replace that position. Many of the legal and administrative functions will be assumed by the Senior City Attorney. This person will also supervise the Safety and Risk Officer.

Finance Department

The Finance Department Director directly reports to the Mayor with a dotted line relationship to the City Council. The Payroll Coordinator, Assistant Finance Director and Senior Accountant all directly report to the Finance Director. The Accounts Payable Coordinator reports to the Assistant Finance Director.

Fire Department

Reporting directly to the Fire Chief will be the Fire Marshall who will supervise the Deputy Fire Marshall and Fire Inspector. The Deputy Chief is a new position and will have three Battalion Chiefs that will be working shifts. Each one will have three Captains reporting depending on the shifts and station. Firefighters and EMTs will report to the Captains.

Mr. Shaver asked if the Deputy Chief position is vacant. Ms. Carter explained that it is vacant; however, it will be filled with a promotion internally. It is required to be a Battalion Chief. Mr. Terry stated that there are currently four Battalion Chiefs, so the Deputy will come from one of those positions. The Office Administrator Supervisor and Office Administrator II remain the same. One thing to note is that the Fire Information Services position will be taken over by the ADS department, although they will still be housed in the Fire station.

Human Resource Department

Here there is the Human Resource Director and two Human Resource Analysts. The Safety and Risk Officer has been moved over to the City Attorney.

Ms. Carter noted that this is still a recommendation until it is approved by the City Council. She will remind the employees of this also.

Library

The Library Director has Support Services, Young Adult Services, and Public Services reporting to the Director. There were some cost cutting measures taken in this area and the organizational structure presented is very similar to the current structure. There are also Technical Services and Children's Services reporting to the Director. Assistant Librarian positions exist under each service area.

Municipal Justice Court

This group includes the Justice Court Judge. All staff in the Justice Court report directly to the Court Administrator. No changes have occurred here.

Police Department

You have the Police Chief and Assistant Chief below. There is support staff reporting to the Police Chief with an Office Administrator III (vacant) and records support staff and receptionist.

There are retirements throughout the department. Ultimately there will two replacements in officers with the final operating numbers down by five officers.

Reporting to the Chief and Assistant Chief will be Outside Forces, Metro and DEA; three Patrol Divisions with Sergeants and Officers; Code Enforcement; Training Sergeant with Crossing Guards and School Resources; Special Operations with Narcotics, Traffic Motors, Court Bailiffs and Warrants; Juvenile Services with Cadets.

To the right is the Internal Affairs division. This includes Criminal Investigation; Detective Sergeants and Detectives; Crime Lab, Field Technicians and Evidence Custodian. You also see the Victim Advocates and Swat Team.

Power Department

There are four charts in power. The first is an overall chart showing the ***General Manager***, Assistant General Manager, Operations Manager, who is a retiree, and the Engineering Manager. Support staff consists of two Office Administrator III positions.

The following chart contains the ***Assistant General Manager*** and the folks who report to him. There are no retirees in this area. The structure has not changed. The same thing applies to the ***Engineering Manager***; with no retirees the structure remains very similar to how it is currently.

The ***Operations*** area is affected by retirees. The Operations Manager will become vacant and the Forestry Supervisor is retiring. The chart shows how the forestry crew will look. Then there are two Service Crew Journey Lineworkers who do the day to day operations in the power department. They rotate in this group of Lineworkers on a yearly basis. There are three Line Crew Supervisors, two of which are vacant.

Public Services Department

The Deputy Director of Public Services is retiring. All reporting to the Public Services Director on an equal basis are the City Engineer (vacant), Street and Storm Water Superintendent, Water and Wastewater Superintendent, Fleet Supervisor, Parks Supervisor, Recreation Director, Cultural Arts Program Manager, Heritage Center Director, Golf Professional, and Golf Superintendent (grounds).

There are seven charts in Public Services with a total of eleven retirees.

The ***City Engineer*** is retiring, and the Engineering Clerk, Senior Civil Engineer, Civil Engineer II, and Engineering Construction Inspector all report to the City Engineer.

The ***Street and Storm Water Superintendent*** chart shows retirees in the Street Field Supervisor and Traffic Coordinator positions.

Mr. Stam asked if the retirement positions, not being replaced, are not shown on the charts. Ms. Carter stated that is correct. The two mentioned above are critical to be replaced.

Water and Wastewater shows vacancies in the Water Distribution Supervisor and Water Distribution Tech positions. The chart indicates the Water and Wastewater staff and support staff positions.

The **Fleet Supervisor** has three positions reporting to it.

The **Golf Professional** has the Assistant Golf Professional II, Assistant Golf Professional, the Café Manager, and Assistant Café Manager who is retiring. This position will not be replaced on a full time basis, but will use seasonal help on an as-needed basis.

Golf Superintendent has grounds staff reporting to it.

The **Parks Department** has a Superintendent with two Parks Field Supervisors, a Cemetery Supervisor and Pool Specialist. The Supervisors have supporting staff reporting to them.

The final chart shows two organizations. The **Recreation Director** has one Office Administrator Supervisor vacant. The **Heritage Center** also has an Office Administrator Supervisor vacant. One shared position exists for the Recreation Coordinator in Recreation and the Program Coordinator at the Heritage Center. The Recreation Department has two Recreation Coordinators and the Park Center Director who manages the Assistant Director, Aquatics Manager and the Building Maintenance Technician.

Ms. Carter said that these are her recommendations for reorganization. She indicated that Mr. Terry and Mr. Johns have been working on the cost savings numbers. She said that the employees will see these same organizational charts on Thursday at the Employee Meeting. On timing, the department heads, both incoming and outgoing, are in the process of meeting with their staff. They have been asked to share the changes within their own department prior to the employee meeting.

Ms. Dunn suggested that the retirements for each department be shown so employees can see that all departments are being affected by the changes.

Ms. Carter added that no one is losing their job, except those who have chosen to retire. This is a great option for cutting costs, helping people save jobs, and still being efficient.

Ms. Dunn said that people have said to her that some departments have opportunity for advancement and others do not. By showing the retirements it indicates that is not true.

Ms. Carter asked if the Council is comfortable with what they are seeing. Ms. Dunn said that she feels everyone has been included and a fantastic job has been done on this. It is important for the employees to know that the Council and department heads support the reorganization, Ms. Carter replied.

Mr. Brass commented that because of the number of retirements the City has a unique opportunity to look at how things are done. As a Council, it has been a dual experience. This is the first time any Council member has really seen how the departments and positions are laid out and organized.

Ms. Dunn would like the employees to remember how difficult the task has been to cut back and balance the budget. This is one way to decrease the budget without eliminating employees. Paring down to a smaller budget and keeping everyone employed is ideal.

Mr. Shaver would like Ms. Carter to stress at the employee meeting that it is the best guess. The Council, Administration and department heads are doing everything they can to anticipate needs, and it will move forward with the knowledge that adjustments may need to be made down the road.

Ms. Carter confirmed that it is a work in progress. She would like everyone to have the attitude to try it, and if it is not working and needs to be changed later, that can always happen.

Mr. Brass thanked Ms. Carter for running through the reorganization plan quickly, and adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Janet M. Lopez
Council Office Administrator