

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

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, January 6, 2009, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Members in Attendance:

Krista Dunn	Council Chairman
Jeff Dredge	Council Member
Robert D. Robertson	Council Member
Jim Brass	Council Member
Patricia W. Griffiths	Council Member

Others in Attendance:

Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Michael D. Wagstaff	Council Executive Director
Janet M. Lopez	Council Administrative Secretary
Jan Wells	Mayor's Chief of Staff
Gabe Epperson	Envision Utah
Pat Wilson	Finance Director
Brent Davidson	Recorder's Office
Tom Baker	Recorder's Office
Carol Heales	City Recorder
Doug Hill	Public Services Director
Erin McShey	Valley Journals
Tim Tingey	Comm. & Econ. Development Director

Chairman Dunn called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 5:35 p.m., welcomed those in attendance, and wished everyone a happy new year.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Dunn asked for a motion on the minutes from the Committee of the Whole meeting held on December 23, 2008. Ms. Griffiths moved approval as written. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

Business Item #1 **Blueprint Jordan River Overview - Gabe
Epperson**

Mr. Epperson referred to the color brochure that he provided to Council Members and

commented that this is the culmination of about two years of planning with the goal to adopt a future vision for the Jordan River corridor. Other studies have been taking place simultaneously with Salt Lake County: an open space study, water quality study, and a trail master plan study. The Blueprint has taken some recommendations from these groups. The focus in Blueprint is the Jordan River and the corridor portions that include a half mile on either side of the Jordan River. The river is more than 50 miles running north from Utah Lake to the Great Salt Lake. This mimics the geography in the Middle East where the Jordan runs between the Dead Sea and the Sea of Galilee. The river encompasses 15 different cities and three counties. All these local governments have been involved in the planning efforts. Tim Tingey and Doug Hill of the Murray staff participated in the project.

Much time was spent in on-line surveys, public workshops and open houses to involve the public and media as much as possible, remarked Mr. Epperson. The top priority of participants was to see restoration and preservation of the river ecosystem, where possible. Other functions and aspects of river usage and development depend on having a healthy ecosystem. The river provides benefits of recreation, economic and ecological systems, such as flood and erosion control, to enhancing quality of life and property values for residents in the region.

In a vision of the future river corridor, one of the more important findings of the survey was that people want to see a green corridor preserved for wildlife, and recreational use, which is secondary and complementary to that. There is a place for development, however, it may be in concentrated areas only. In terms of economic development, people recognized that the Jordan River will be best preserved and used as a natural area, with long term benefits which will allow promotion of the area for tourism.

In implementation, three common themes emerged which Mr. Epperson showed in a series of montages using “before” and “after” simulation pictures:

- Preserve remaining open space - create nature areas with board walks and interpretive signs, similar to what Murray has already done.
- Recreational amenities - there is a vision for support facilities for boating, and multi use trails. (The Frontrunner train runs next to the river, due to the narrow space.)
- Opportunity for urban renewal - older industrial and commercial uses can be seen as an opportunity for developing living, shopping, and recreational areas.

A series of maps illustrates the principles, policies and ideas of the vision. The following guiding principles encapsulate the Blueprint plan:

- Preserve and rehabilitate the natural features of the river, hydrologic primarily.
- Implement buffers between the river and development.

- Restore riparian and in-stream habitats.
- Reduce hard scape such as concrete and pavement near the corridor.
- Manage storm water on site for existing and future development.
- Balance recreation and public access with river protection.
- Adopt low impact development strategies, such as clustering development, using “green” roofs, and reducing parking.
- Encourage regional transportation for trails and access to the river.

Mr. Epperson explained that for land use within the river corridor, an over arching policy framework has been developed. The purpose of this is to balance development and preservation.

- The first policy is to preserve and rehabilitate remaining undeveloped areas that are priorities. This includes flood planes, wetlands and valuable habitats. Around 7300 acres have been identified that fall into that category. Approximately half of that has been designated for development by the cities.
- Policy two states that areas planned for development and in conflict with the above policy should be a priority for land acquisition and protection. Strategies for purchasing land, land swaps and mitigation are being considered.
- Third, those areas that fall outside of open space, however, are still close to the river, should be subject to low impact development standards.

Mr. Epperson described a future land use map with the river in the center and green areas surrounding that have been identified as priority open space. Less than a quarter of the study area is requested to remain open space.

Big ideas of the future vision include a continuous lake for travel by boat, foot or bicycle from lake to lake. The natural corridor is 7800 acres, which does not include the Legacy Nature Preserve in the north. The desire is to create a natural corridor for viewing wildlife and escape from the city.

Seven regional river centers have been determined added Mr. Epperson. These centers would provide commercial and recreational activities, some businesses, and restaurants. It is felt that this is an important use, as long as the locations are identified, well planned and limited.

Enhancement of regional access was thoroughly considered. Transportation access is an important factor in bringing people to the river and along the river.

Epic trips have been discussed to promote tourism and recreation with lake to lake boating, wildlife viewing, hiking, history and culture tours, and environmental education. The

Murray Kennecott Nature Center has been used as a model for this concept.

The Murray area of the Jordan River was featured on a slide by Mr. Epperson, showing the surrounding areas of the river, which has been preserved by Murray City.

Mr. Epperson directed the group to notice an area called the Cottonwood Confluence, which is one of the seven regional activity centers, this one located in Murray. The location is currently commercial and industrial and over the years, as properties redevelop, it would be a great place to encourage commercial and recreational support businesses which create an interface with the river. It has great regional transportation access and is already developed.

Data collected on river frontage shows that Murray has some of the better frontage along the river, with both sides of the river in some spots. A graph showing the number of acres in parks versus the number planned for development was displayed. Other cities present a major challenge, such as Bluffdale, Lehi and Saratoga Springs, with 800 to 1800 acres, in preserving some of the remaining land. Murray has approximately 6.5 frontage miles and 220 acres in the preservation corridor. About 45 acres in the general plan seem to be designated for residential development. The Blueprint focus group is hoping to create a river commission or authority to look at preserving some of that area, or if development occurs they would like to see some type of clustering or buffer to protect the river in those areas.

The Blueprint has Murray containing the river center, Cottonwood Confluence, and a FrontRunner stop that can provide access and interaction with the river and abundant recreational and wildlife opportunities.

On implementation, the thoughts are that a commission or river authority needs to be created to coordinate activities among the cities. Murray is an example of a city that has done the right thing and it has been done on its own. Other cities do not have the same kind of vision and see open space by the river as locations for homes. The commission would be made up of local government representation and various state agencies that have jurisdiction over some areas of the river. It would have a dedicated source of funding for open space acquisition and capital projects. A variety of funding strategies have been identified to help toward these efforts.

The Blueprint group would like to take a number of interim steps this year, including, establishing a proxy committee to set up the formalized structure for the ongoing commission, that will authorize legislation in 2010. Each city is being asked to appoint an elected official to sit on this committee. There is a resolution, drafted by County Councilman David Wilde, that Mr. Epperson hopes Murray will consider as an action item at the next City Council meeting. He also suggests that the Blueprint report be adopted as an advisory document to the City general plan. The interim committee will meet about six times over the year beginning in February.

Ms. Dunn commented that Murray started long ago, before any of the current Council

Members were in office, to preserve the river front and has done a good job.

Mr. Brass asked about the water quality and how much Utah Lake has had an impact on the quality of the river. He wondered if this has been taken into account.

Mr. Epperson responded that the water quality is demonstratively deficient in the summer months when water flow is very low. With low flow and insufficient shade the water heats up and algal blooms occur. Increased water flow and a retrofit of water treatment facilities would produce a dramatic increase in water quality. The water quality plan completed by the county is very extensive and will have to occur to have a river that becomes a tourist attraction with boating activities. It may take 10 to 15 years for the water quality to increase and the county and different stakeholders are working toward that.

Ms. Dunn thanked Mr. Epperson for his report and stated that the Council will talk about a representative to sit on the Blueprint Jordan River commission.

Business Item #2 Murray City Center Building Report - Carol Heales

Ms. Heales began her power point presentation stating that she faces frustrations every year trying to address the various condition issues in the building. Her report was an effort to discover how to prepare a budget with unexpected repairs arising. In researching this she analyzed the age and condition of the building and the corresponding impact of that on the budget.

Her first slide was to determine the age of the building and its typical life cycle age. The major building components were considered, including the foundation, exterior, interior. The life cycle was determined based on the age of the building, which varied depending upon when additions to the building were made. The total life cycle of all the building components is divided by the number of building components, giving an average building life cycle. For this building the average life cycle is 32.25 years. The actual age of the building is 30.2 years. The difference can be attributed to replacement of the boiler and new cooling units which bring the age down. The remaining life is .75 years. The foundation is beyond its life cycle in some areas and presenting problems in upkeep.

Ms. Heales has observed from her research that the Murray City Center condition is typical for a public building. Across the nation, at any level of government, universities, colleges and other city buildings show that Murray is not unique in that respect. In analyzing the budget it looks to be in line, however, capital repair and replacements have been deferred because the funds were not available and that causes increased needs as the building continues to age.

It helps to have a capital replacement plan in place because emergency repairs or replacements currently must be paid out of the operating budget. Energy efficiency is a big

concern. If an assessment were to be done for an energy retrofit the cost would be about \$1.75 per square foot, equaling about \$74,000 and the payback would be between two to five years.

To determine an estimate of annual budget maintenance needs, for capital improvements nearly \$75,000 per year would be necessary to address deferred maintenance or to stay ahead. The annual repair and maintenance formula comes to about \$224,000. These formulas take the replacement value of the building divided by the age of the building. In the capital budget, the figure 1275 equals a 50-year time period. For annual maintenance a 25-year span is generally used. When the two dollar figures are added together, the total is \$299,000. In the current fiscal year no capital was requested, however, the total maintenance budget, including labor and miscellaneous items, is \$307,524.

Mr. Davidson mentioned that in the last two to three years the budget has been exceeded by \$10,000 to \$12,000. Six months into the current fiscal year and maintenance costs have already exceeded the budget by about \$8,500 on that line item. He added that the roof repair was \$30,000 alone.

Ms. Heales addressed some critical needs of the building.

- An engineering assessment should be completed on the exterior south end of the building to discover the source of the brick and roof separation. To conduct this assessment the wall will have to be torn apart, which is an expense costing about \$10,000.
- The sewer line repair was done about five years ago, which took care of only a specific section. The City may be faced with additional repairs on the sewer line.
- Most windows leak because they are past the life cycle. Mr. Baker mentioned that the leaks occur anytime there is rain with wind, because the seals are missing, rotted and decayed.
- Ongoing roof patching indicates that a new membrane roof is needed.
- Carpet in the main traffic areas need replacing. The estimate for carpeting is \$22,000.
- There is an odor near the back entrance. The wall needs to be opened and a smoke bomb used to discover the cause. No estimate on that expense was available.

Ms. Heales presented her recommendations based on the possibility of a new City Center.

- Prioritize critical needs before funding.
- Consider requesting funds for a capital line item in the budget for building maintenance. This would be without a specific request attached in order to address unanticipated replacements or repairs. Currently the expenditures go into building maintenance, therefore, it is difficult to track capital improvements.
- Develop a capital replacement plan for the existing building or future buildings.

Ms. Heales continued with a photo tour showing current condition issues of the building. A crack near the attorney's office on the southwest end goes all the way through to the outside of the building. An exterior shot shows the wall shifting and pulling away from the window and the corner is starting to sag.

Another series of pictures showed a new crack on the southwest end, above the first floor employee break room. The corner is sagging there, as well. The steps near the fountain and bricks around the front entrance are cracking, shifting and sinking.

Sewer lines have been patched in several places; caps and joints are leaking with raw sewage on the floor. Deterioration of the ceiling and pipes in the basement are being replaced as needed.

Roof pictures detailed the patched areas and additional decaying locations, which are patched as necessary. There are some previously patched areas that are decaying again, a cracked wall, and broken conduit. There was a picture of the recently patched area above the Police evidence room, where water was leaking into the building. This was the emergency repair that cost about \$30,000. Additional decay and cracking under the air-conditioning unit is visible, which is next to the evidence room patch.

A final slide shows an area of replaced carpet in the Council Chambers where the floor was cut away and the ground actually dug up for a sleeve to be put in the sewer line where a break occurred a few years back.

In closing Ms. Heales pointed out that when these unexpected repair needs develop, they are awfully expensive.

Mr. Dredge asked Ms. Heales to identify and prioritize emergency repairs while the Council is considering other options.

There being no staff report or additional business Chairman Dunn adjourned the meeting at 6:12 p.m.

Janet M. Lopez
Administrative Secretary