



MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, February 2, 2016, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

Council Members in Attendance:

Blair Camp, Chair	District #2
Diane Turner, Vice-Chair	District #4
Dave Nicponski	District #1
Jim Brass	District #3

Council Members Excused:

Brett Hales	District #5
-------------	-------------

Others in Attendance:

Ted Eyre	Mayor	Janet Towers	Exec. Asst. to the Mayor
Janet M. Lopez	Council Administrator	Tim Tingey	ADS Director
Jan Wells	Chief Admin. Officer	Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Jennifer Kennedy	City Recorder	Pattie Johnson	Council Office
Craig Burnett	Police Chief	Steve Roberson	Resident

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

1. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Camp asked for approval on the Committee of the Whole minutes from December 1, 2015. Mr. Camp detailed corrections. Ms. Turner made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected. Mr. Brass seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

2. Business Items

2.1 Discuss the Murray City Resident Survey – Tim Tingey

Mr. Camp stated that he found the survey to be very interesting and introduced Mr. Tingey to share the analysis. Mr. Tingey shared a Power Point presentation. He explained that the survey was a very important tool in the process for creation of the new General Plan (GP) for Murray City. He advised the Council that the Administrative Development Services (ADS) conducted major outreach on the GP process. Multiple meetings had been held and Mr. Tingey explained the survey was another component to better understand the perceptions of the City's residents, particularly related to the attitudes of the community. This was the main purpose of the survey. The ADS spent many hours to accomplish all of this. Fifteen hundred surveys were mailed. Working with programmers was essential, in order to obtain a fairly even distribution of randomly selected residents in each council district.

The survey was sent out anonymously but they were color coded according to each district. A summary page of results was created for each individual district and an *Executive Summary* report reflected all the data. The report was very large because of the content of the open ended responses on the survey. Mr. Tingey said he had hoped all of this information would be very helpful for the Council Members and said it was important to understand the process of obtaining all the information. Sorting out the data took some time to achieve the compiled analysis.

Out of 1500 surveys distributed, 342 surveys were returned. This was a 23 percent response rate. Mr. Tingey explained that according to survey research, a desirable return rate is 20-30 percent, with a 4.88 percent margin of error. He clarified that this meant there was a 95 percent certainty that the results of the survey were within the margin of error.

Mr. Tingey highlighted the "**demographics**" of the respondents.

- Between the ages of 45-64 43%
- Over 65 years of age 33%
- Female 56%
- Home owners 91%
- Resident for more than 21 years 49%
- Average household income \$65,000 54%

He said this did not surprise him. The City's population is getting older and many of these people love Murray and have lived here for quite some time. Mr. Tingey explained it is very difficult to get renters to respond to these types of surveys and typically do not get high responses from them.

The survey began by asking residents for three reasons "**why they lived in Murray**". These were open ended questions. A few significant things identified in the analysis were:

- Central location (a big issue)
- Convenience of the community
- Neighborhood community, friends and schools

Next, respondents were asked to give a **“word or phrase to describe Murray”**. Results included:

- *“Great Place to Live”*
- *“Home”*
- *“Small-town Feel”*
- *“Community/Neighborhoods”*
- *“Well Run/Good Government!”*

Mr. Tingey stated it was great to see the comment about city government. In general, there were many, many positive comments, and some that were not. Overall, he said the way residents feel about Murray was very positive.

“Quality of life features” were incorporated into the survey. Mr. Tingey explained that residents were asked to rank a number of features in the community. He pointed out a few of the highlighted percentages in the very good and excellent range:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| • Sense of security and safety | 61% |
| • Access to and from City government and elected officials | 50% |
| • Close to shopping | 46% |
| • Parks and open spaces | 49% |
| • Transitions between residential and commercial areas | 53% |
| • Recreational programs | 58% |

Mr. Tingey pointed out that one of the *features* with a low percentage rate was entertainment, which was access to movies, theaters, museums, exhibits halls, etc. He said this was not a real surprise, since the City does not have many of those to offer.

“Positive neighborhood elements” was addressed on the survey. Respondents were asked what three elements are the most important for neighborhoods. A few of the significant results in this category were:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| • Safe, low crime (the number one important element) | 74% |
| • Clean properties are maintained (second in most important) | 45% |
| • Amenities - schools and parks | 48% |
| • Neighborhood is sought after/people choose to live there | 28% |

There were multiple **“housing”** related questions to get public input. The reason for this was, as part of the GP and as part of State Code, the City has to update its housing plan every three to four years. These specific questions would help to develop the next housing plan.

“Whether the City has enough different types of housing” in the community was important to ask. Mr. Tingey shared the results for probably or definitely have enough:

- Single family detached homes 65%

- Townhomes 71%
- Duplex, triplex, fourplex 78%
- Apartments 86%
- Housing above retail or office 50%
- Condominiums 64%

Mr. Tingey felt that there were some slight contradictions in the housing section when another question asked was "***what is most needed in housing***". He shared these findings:

- Single family homes 81%
- Senior living facilities 32%

Mr. Tingey pointed out these were the two highest elements of housing that residents felt the City has need for, although, the second housing type most needed was townhomes and condominiums.

Mr. Tingey explained when asked about support for various housing types, again, single family homes, townhomes, condominiums all received high percentages of support. Apartment's duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and senior living, received much lower support numbers. Housing above retail offices also had lower support numbers but there was a high percentage of people that responded that it "*depends*" on that type of housing, because they felt more information was needed to respond adequately to whether or not it was needed.

The "***community initiatives***" section, which are issues related to land use was addressed. Mr. Tingey explained that in the past, ADS had received many inquiries about land use; so he felt including these questions on the survey was very important. He shared the following information regarding various issues:

Recycling sustainability and green initiatives

- Very important 57%
- Somewhat important 28%

Allowing bees and chickens in neighborhoods, Mr. Tingey felt there would be a more definitive line on how residents felt about this issue. Responses indicated what had been heard during some of the public meetings in the past. He shared first the following results for **chickens**:

- Not important 40%
- Very or somewhat important 29%
- Depends 31%

Mr. Tingey pointed out when looking at the data, there are more residents that feel chickens are not important to have in neighborhoods. Once again, he informed the Council that it was a very broad range.

Mr. Brass added this subject is not a gray area with the residents he has spoken to. He explained they are either very much in favor, or very against or very passionate about it. Mr. Tingey agreed saying he too had seen residents express their passion for beekeeping at several meetings.

Beekeeping results were very similar. Mr. Tingey stated that with an undecided at 35 percent, it is clear that residents are not really sure how they feel about beekeeping in neighborhood. The results were:

- Very or somewhat important 38%
- Very or somewhat unimportant 27%
- Undecided 35%

Plant materials in street planter strips was also part of the “*community initiatives*” section with results reflecting the following:

- Very or somewhat important 31%
- Somewhat or very unimportant 41%

Once again, Mr. Tingey explained this was not a very definitive indication about how residents feel.

High rise or dense development in the downtown area reflected the following results:

- Somewhat or very important 55%
- Unimportant or very unimportant 20%

Mr. Tingey said this was a fairly good indication that residents approve of moving forward with dense development in the downtown area and it would be good for the City.

Next “*the Murray Library*” offered three questions and the following results were shared:

- Utilized library or website in the past year 58%
 - 22% percent of those using it, indicated that they used it over 20 times a year.
 - 22% percent of those using it, indicated they use it five to nine times per year.
- Had not utilized library or website in the past year 42%

Mr. Tingey explained that only eight percent, which is not very many, knew about “**Neighbor Works**”. He suggested that more marketing efforts need to occur on these programs.

Survey respondents were also asked to indicate a level of importance, regarding several General Plan concept issues. Mr. Tingey said obviously, the Council will have to make decisions on these, but ADS thought it was important to verify information as identified in GP public meetings. Overall, he said there was very strong support for these concepts and the input was really good from the citizens. Survey results showed the following on *very or somewhat important*:

- Creating a true downtown center, and culture district 60%
- Property maintenance (a significant amount) 94%
- Connecting downtown to transit opportunities 74%
- Connect neighborhoods to shopping, entertainment, transportation 62%
- Office and employment centers 44%
 - 34% indicated it depends and 23% not important.
- Linking Intermountain Medical Center to surrounding services, like medical offices, grocery stores, hotels and retail space. 66%
- Maintaining historic buildings instead of allowing new construction 48%
 - 24% indicated it depends and 18% stated this is not important
- Biking 44%
 - 20% depends, 33% not important
- Trails and Connections 75%
- Vibrant and Livable Neighborhoods 93%

Mr. Tingey said this goes with all of what the City is working towards on downtown redevelopment. On biking, the public input meetings in the past, indicated a strong, strong support for better biking lanes. The survey results are a lot more spread out with high percentages saying it is not important.

A question about **parks** was also on the survey asking **“which park do you use most often?”** Mr. Tingey explained the reasons for this section. He hoped it would be helpful for the Council in the budgeting process, now that funds are available to utilize towards parks and capital improvement. Results were:

- Murray Park 95%
- Southwood Park 9%
- Jordan Parkway 8%

When asked about **“what improvements could be made”** in the parks, the results showed:

- Upkeep, renovation or addition 24%
- Satisfied 15%

Mr. Tingey expressed that a large amount of residents seem to be satisfied with the City’s parks without any improvements.

“What is the single most important thing that could be done to improve the City”, was another question that Mr. Tingey discussed on the survey. Results were:

- Maintenance and renovation 29%
- Low crime or law enforcement 17%
- Don’t know 26%

Mr. Tingey expressed that 26 percent responded they did not know. He said this means a pretty high number of respondents feel very good about the City since they did not have any input on how it could be improved. He said these were interesting results, as well.

Ms. Turner commented that one thing she noticed on the items to improve, was much concern about drugs in neighborhoods. She said she was very surprised about that and it was a little shocking. Mr. Tingey agreed. He added that this was related to crime and enforcement and in just about any community, drugs will always be an issue.

In "**conclusion**" Mr. Tingey explained that all the information from the survey had been included in the *Executive Summary* and he highlighted the most significant findings:

- Citizens generally feel positive about our community
- Residents feel it is a great place to live with a well-run government
- Quality of life is important, including neighborhood appearance, safety and security
- Recreational programs and open spaces are very important
- More single family homes and senior living facilities (Other types of units being less important.)
- Residents are generally supportive of recycling and sustainability and green initiatives
- Beekeeping and chickens was a mixed conclusion
- A strong number of residents use the library
- There is a need for marketing of the Neighbor Works programs
- The General Plan concepts of the downtown planning are greatly supported

Mr. Tingey concluded the survey information was general in nature for the Council to think about and consider. He hoped it would be helpful when responding to residents and a tool that points out the feelings and thoughts of constituents about certain issues. He indicated the survey validates much of the public input that was received on the first draft of the GP. He said ADS would be deliberating more and getting additional public input on those concepts for the Council to consider going forward.

This data may prove helpful as the mayor and council pursue capital and operational funding in the areas of park enhancement, public safety and working to enhance neighborhoods.

Mr. Camp commented that he was surprised at the low percentages indicated on the use of the Parkway trail, only 8%. Mr. Tingey said that maybe they were just so focused on the word park, that some respondents did not consider the Parkway as being a park.

Mr. Tingey informed the Council that the downtown redevelopment process was validated with the results. However Mr. Tingey stated that in moving forward, a review of balance between neighborhood perceptions versus market conditions, will constantly need to be evaluated in our downtown development approval process.

The housing data obtained from the survey, will be very important to help shape the housing market analysis and would help the City to adhere to the Utah State Code requirements. He said ADS would definitely be moving forward with this.

On the urban farming issues (chicken and bees ordinances) Mr. Tingey said the Council has discretion for decisions on those policies, however, he suggested not moving forward at this time due to a lack of consensus based on the survey. He said it is hard to provide significant justification at this time.

Mr. Tingey reported the ADS staff put a lot of time into this survey. He added that the City actually saved money doing everything except enter the data, which was done by an outside group. He said he was very proud of his staff for all of their efforts and believes all of the information is good. Mr. Tingey hoped the scientific survey could be conducted again, every three to four years; to bench mark where the City is now and compare it to how residents feel in the future. Being able to see how residents feel about the policies implemented by the Council at a later date, would be helpful and interesting to identify.

Ms. Turner asked about the cost of the survey. Mr. Tingey said it would have cost \$21,000 to \$22,000 to have an outside group do the entire survey. He explained his department did everything, except enter in the data and that cost was around \$9,000.

2.2 Arizona Arts Facilities Tour Briefing – Tim Tingey, Blair Camp and Diane Turner

Mr. Tingey shared a Power Point to explain the information gathered from touring seven art facilities in Arizona. The seven facilities were:

- ❖ **Phoenix Center for the Arts**
- ❖ **Peoria Center for the Performing Arts**
- ❖ **Mesa Arts Center**
- ❖ **Scottsdale Art Museum and Center for the Performing Arts**
- ❖ **Gilbert Hale Center Theater**
- ❖ **Tempe Center for the Arts**
- ❖ **Chandler Arts Center**

Mr. Tingey shared photos and presented valuable information to explain the highlights of each facility visited.

First on the tour was the **Phoenix Center for the Arts**. Joseph Benesh, the Director and Lauren Hension, the Marketing Director provided the tour. Mr. Tingey explained that The Phoenix Center for Arts was a newly developed area in the newer downtown portion of Phoenix. It was not located in the high rise areas of the city. He pointed out a new building that was constructed right up against the street. He wanted to highlight this, because it was very interesting to see it situated that way. The Phoenix Center is fairly similar in size, to some of Murray's potential projects. Arizona State University happened to be one of the major tenants for this particular building. The Phoenix Center for the Arts was located in an older facility, which was once a Baptist church. The building sprawled out to a fairly significant size of 33,000 square feet. Owned and funded by the City of Phoenix it was operated by a 501(c)3 group. The City provides free rent for the center which is approximately \$600,000 per year. The City of Phoenix also provides operating grants to this organization. Phoenix rents out their facility as

somewhat of an arts incubator, to a number of different art groups. Some of these, whether art facilities or not, provide the City with a great deal of their income.

Mr. Camp announced for the record that Councilman Nicponski had arrived.

Mr. Tingey continued to explain how more of the space was utilized and rented out in their building. He described rooms for open space, performing art practices, art classes and many other art group uses. About 1,200 to 2,000 students are going through the center over a years' time.

At the **Peoria Center for the Performing Arts**, Dan Shay, the Center Director provided the tour. This facility is owned by the City of Peoria and a nonprofit group called Theater Works Group operates it. They have a variety of performances occurring each year. The Black Box Theater seats 275 people and the City provides approximately one third of the \$400,000 budget for operations. Things such as ticket sales, fund raisers and other income made up the remainder. He pointed out it was exciting to see it located in the downtown area, which itself was not incredibly large. He also added that Peoria is a larger city than he thought with mostly residential living. Ms. Turner commented that she thought the population was 250,000. Mr. Tingey confirmed that.

Mr. Tingey shared other photos of their main theater, other useful rooms and a puppet stage where they held a very strong puppet program. There was a discussion on seating and it was noted that at least 550 seats are needed in order to make money.

Scottsdale Arts Museum was the next tour. Alley Hanes Hamilin, the Director provided the tour. Mr. Tingey indicated they visited the museum when some of the facilities were not open. They were able to see the large performing arts facility, seating 850, which was very beautiful. Another complex located beside the performing arts, was an arts museum and other elements, in a campus style approach with retail space surrounding the facility, including a hotel in the front. Visitors could stay overnight, dine and catch a performance afterwards at the facility or tour the museum. Mr. Camp added that their city hall complex was located in this area as well. A small amphitheater was in the same area, which blended with walkways to the City Hall building. He described the fountains around the city hall, the arts complex and pointed out a little grass knoll with a small sitting area. Once again, he indicated all city facilities were incorporated together. Ms. Turner added that it was very beautiful.

The third visit was the **Mesa Arts Center**. Cindy Ornstein was the City Director of Art Facilities and provided the tour. Originally from New York, she was very passionate about the center. Ms. Turner expressed how amazing this facility was. Mr. Tingey agreed and noted it was hard to describe. The complex was located right next to one of their transit stops. It was 212,000 square feet of buildings located on seven and half acres, right in the heart of the downtown. The facility provided everything from performing arts, to educational arts facilities, arts museums and art galleries, all of which were amazing. The Center is owned and operated by Mesa City with 72 full time employees and 56 part time employees. Some of the programs are conducted by full time art teachers and their group was able to see some of the artwork. Mr. Tingey reported their annual budget is \$16 million, which is massive for what they have. Mayor Eyre asked the population of the City. Mr. Tingey replied that it was 350,000 to 400,000. It is a

large city but does not offer a big downtown area. He pointed out city hall in a photograph, which was right across the street from the art facility. With a Power Point, he shared the main theater. He explained that throughout the entire center there were many different art theme expressions. For instance one auditorium incorporated a design of leaves on the chairs for a garden theme or vegetation theme. Vegetation designs were on seats and configured into the lighting, where shadows were cast in the shape of leaves. The flooring was woven with certain angles and reflected a sand theme, which was very unique. He continued to share more interesting pictures of the facility. Using the elements of wind, it provided movement of metal pieces making it extraordinary. Ms. Turner added that the metal was etched so that when the wind blew the metal would ripple. She said it was very beautiful. Mr. Tingey pointed out more chairs that were designed by a well-known architect from Germany, and were obtained because of a grant received.

A second building at the Mesa Center included an art gallery. This was an interesting space because it provided open space for conducting various functions. It was not a huge gallery but could be utilized for wall exhibits only or other types of performing arts. Attached to this room was a little black box theater. Mr. Tingey explained this could be utilized for a variety of things such as training, small group use, or for watching films and other things. Mr. Tingey suggested this type of room would be a great small feature that could be located in our downtown and not overly costly. He said whether it's utilizing the Murray Theater space or in another facility, this was a great example of what is applicable to Murray and what we may be looking at in the future. More pictures of the complex were shown and he pointed out buildings for classes, art, including teaching pottery, glass and jewelry. It was all part of the education facility.

At the **Tempe Center for Arts** Don Fassinger, the Director guided the tour. Mr. Tingey explained this was a very large facility with a 600 seat theater. The Director indicated they could not make a lot of money in this theater because they needed more seating. There was also an art gallery inside the facility with rotating art exhibits. He pointed out the gallery had other spaces that could be rented out for weddings and various music groups. The look and feel was very nice and the design included a lot of wood. Another room overlooked the Salt River and a reservoir. A dam, waterfalls and waterfall features were visible and used for rental space and city functions. Ms. Turner indicated mirrors were included in the design at the Tempe Center for Arts.

Michelle MacLennan at the **Chandler Arts Center** gave this tour. Mr. Tingey explained that this was owned and operated by both the school district and the City. The school district would utilize the facility Monday through Thursday and the City would utilize it on Fridays and for weekend functions. This facility was a \$3 to 4 million operation. Mr. Tingey asked the other council members who had also attended the tour trip to describe this facility, since it was so unique.

Mr. Camp commented that it was a 1,500 seat auditorium and as you walk in you could see tracks on either side of the door, and throughout the room. This was a motorized auditorium. One side had 250 seats that could rotate around facing another stage in a separate theater. The other side had about 350 seats and could operate the same way. Both would rotate around to a larger area with a light booth, sound booth and bigger stage. Mayor Eyre added this area also had a movie screen. Mr. Camp stated that, in theory you could actually have three different events going on at the same time. You could have 250, 350 or about 1,000 seats going on at the

same time. They could also open it up to 1500 seats. Mr. Camp said it was very unique and an incredible use of space. Mr. Tingey showed pictures of the auditorium and explained how they rotated while the group was sitting there. Mayor Eyre added that all the walls were sound proof and provided a barrier between theaters.

Mr. Tingey stated that located on the ground floor was an art gallery called the Vision Arts Center. It was about 1,500 square feet of gallery space. As we work to develop arts in Murray City, what was learned here will be very valuable.

Ms. Turner added they also visited the council chambers of Chandler City.

The Mayor noted that just about all of these people are crazy about the arts. Many of the employees at the art center were city staff, paid by the City with full benefits. Ms. Turner commented that most of these were 501(c)3s even if the facilities were owned by the city.

Mr. Tingey explained that many of these facilities utilized a fund taxing source for the quality of life for arts type features. Some of it was used for building and constructions projects, and taxed 1% for those construction projects. that they utilized for the arts. This was how they provided a lot of their funding.

Mr. Camp stated that the Chandler facility was located on the edge of the high school campus; it was very unique and a good partnership that worked well between the city and the school district. Mr. Brass added that Park City Center for the Performing Arts, is the Park City School auditorium. Mr. Tingey agreed.

All those who attended agreed it was a very interesting, informative and insightful trip. Mr. Camp noted all of the facilities they visited had some kind of financial support from the city to survive. They were all very different, had support from their communities and cities. He said he thought most all of them were nonprofit. Ms. Turner confirmed all were 501(c)3s. He added that none of them were standalone, self-sufficient and all were very, very valuable to the community. All were great economic development drivers some more than others.

Ms. Turner observed the facility located by the Salt River was a standalone facility which was not part of a community and it had suffered as a result. That was one of the negatives for that particular facility.

Mayor Eyre concluded that what was really impressed upon the group, was the importance of art in the community. He said if you are going to become a complete community and you are going to provide what you need for a community to be complete, you must have a serious, well thought out art component. He affirmed this was a very valuable lesson. He said he believed that in the schools and sometimes in other cities, the arts programs are usually the first thing cut when budgets are tight. He stated they were all very glad to find out just how important the arts are for the community.

Mr. Turner commented that according to the recent survey taken, quality of life was very important to Murray citizens and thinks that the arts lends itself in a very positive way to quality of life.

Mr. Brass responded that Robert Redford recently stated just how big the Sundance Film Festival had become. Although he prefers not splitting it up, if they go that direction there may be an opportunity to get Murray as a Sundance venue with the junior high, high school and performing arts center at the Murray Theater. Mr. Brass also pointed out what Cedar City had done with the Shakespeare Festival. He said they were nothing until the festival came about. Ms. Turner agreed that it has really enhanced the city.

Mr. Camp thanked Mr. Tingey for the arts presentation of the tour.

3. Announcements

Ms. Lopez announced that Thursday, February 11, 2016 was the City School Coordinating Council meeting at the new school district offices.

Mr. Camp added that the Heritage Center would be having their ribbon cutting at 11:15 a.m. in the newly added room.

4. Adjournment

6:26 p.m.

Pattie Johnson
Office Administrator