

Murray City Municipal Council Chambers Murray City, Utah

The Municipal Council of Murray City, Utah, met on Tuesday, the 21st day of April, 2009 at 6:30 p.m., for a meeting held in the Murray City Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Roll Call consisted of the following:

Jeff Dredge,	Council Chair - Conducted
Krista Dunn,	Council Member
Pat Griffiths,	Council Member
Robbie Robertson,	Council Member
Jim Brass,	Council Member - Excused

Others who attended:

Daniel Snarr,	Mayor
Jan Wells,	Chief of Staff
Michael Wagstaff,	Council Director
Carol Heales,	City Recorder
Frank Nakamura,	City Attorney
Gilbert Rodriguez,	Fire Chief
Tim Tingey,	Community Development Director
Doug Hill,	Public Services Director
Blaine Haacke,	General Manager
Patricia Wilson,	Finance Director
Clint Nordin,	Forestry
Jim Hendrickson,	Shade Tree Commission
Jayl Bollwinkel,	Murray History Board
Citizens	

A. OPENING CEREMONIES

1. Pledge of Allegiance - Gilbert Rodriguez, Fire Chief
2. Approval of Minutes for April 7, 2009:

Ms. Dunn made a motion to approve the minutes.
Mr. Robertson 2nd the motion.

Voice vote taken; All Ayes

3. Special Recognition:
 1. **Consider a Joint Resolution of the Mayor and Municipal Council of Murray City, Utah declaring Friday, April 24, 2009 as Arbor Day.**

Mr. Dredge read the Resolution in its entirety.

Ms. Dunn made a motion to adopt the Resolution.
Ms. Griffiths 2nd the motion

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales:

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed 4-0

Mayor Snarr presented the Resolution to Jim Hendrickson, saying that Mr. Hendrickson is the longest serving, Shade Tree Commission member in the history of Murray City. The City appreciates his love for the commission, and what it does for the City. Mr. Hendrickson has done a great job, and this celebration sets us apart from other cities, it is now going on 31 years; coming into the City, you recognize it as being "Tree City USA", longer than any other city in Utah. In cooperation with the County, Murray has done many nice projects in re-vegetating the City, the Jordan River Parkway, as well as taking out the non-desirable trees in the City, and reintroducing the natural habitat and vegetation that should be along the Parkway.

Staff Presentation: Jim Hendrickson, Shade Tree Commission

Mr. Hendrickson corrected the time that the Arbor Day Celebration will be held: 12:00, on Friday, April 24, 2009, at the Murray Park Amphitheater. He said that the Department of Wildlife will be bringing in animals and birds, along with other educational exhibits at the celebration.

Mr. Hendrickson thanked the Mayor for the honor, and for letting them be such an active part of Murray City; they hope to continue their work for many years.

Mr. Dredge asked that Mr. Brass be excused from the meeting.

B. CITIZEN COMMENTS (Comments are limited to 3 minutes unless otherwise approved by the Council.)

None given

Public Comment closed.

C. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Dredge asked that the following confirmations be taken together. No objections were noted.

- 1. Consider confirmation of the Mayor's appointment of Steven Meyer to the Murray History Advisory Board representing District 5 for a term to expire August 1, 2011.**
- 2. Consider confirmation of the Mayor's appointment of Susan Wright to the Murray History Advisory Board in an At-Large position for a term to expire August 1, 2009.**

Ms. Dunn made a motion to adopt the Resolution.
Ms. Griffiths 2nd the motion

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales:

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed 4-0

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Staff and sponsor presentations, public comment, and discussion prior to Council action on the following matter:

None scheduled

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None scheduled

F. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Consider a Resolution authorizing the execution of an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between the City and Salt Lake County for sharing of Election Services for the City's 2009 Municipal Election.**

Staff presentation: Carol Heales, City Recorder

Ms. Heales stated that this is to provide election services for this years primary and general elections. This year they are basing the estimated fee on a per voter formula, rather than relying heavily on the polling location; what this means to Murray is that a per voter cost will be \$1.59 for the primary election, and \$1.73 per voter for the general election; this is a not to exceed price of \$93,145.92. If we do not have a primary in every district, the cost will be less, and the County has assured the City that the cost will not exceed this amount. The City does have a City-wide election this year, including a mayoral race, which does increase the cost over the past year.

Some new things for the election this year: Ms. Heales will be revising the Candidate Guide, making it more user-friendly, and there will be forms posted on our website for the candidates to use; candidate qualifications and biographies will

be posted on the Lieutenant Governor's website, and campaign financial statements will also be posted on our website or on the State website, which are new requirements for this election year.

Ms. Heales said that Janie Richardson, GIS, is working on a program to integrate Sunguard software on the land management parcel with election information to allow us to click on a parcel within the City and see a persons voting location, and who their representative is.

The primary election will be held on September 15, 2009, and the general election will be on November 03, 2009.

Ms. Griffiths made a motion to adopt the Resolution.
Ms. Dunn 2nd the motion

Ms. Dunn made a motion to adopt the Resolution.
Ms. Griffiths 2nd the motion

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales:

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed 4-0

2. **Consider an Ordinance relating to excavations; amends Sections 3.10.640 and 3.10.650 of the Murray City Municipal Code, relating to road cuts.**

Staff presentation: Doug Hill, Public Services Director

Mr. Hill stated that the City has an Ordinance which regulates what a person or company must do to cut within a public right-of-way, street, sidewalk or park strip. It has been many years since this Ordinance has been updated, and a lot of the information and requirements that are in the Ordinance are out dated or don't apply in our world today.

Bonding requirements: our current Ordinance requires that a \$5,000 bond be posted and that it be valid for one year. What they are proposing with the amendment is that the bonding requirements will be maintained on a schedule that will be approved through the Mayor's Office, so that as prices go up over time, they can adjust that. Currently, they are proposing that the bonding Ordinance be

increased to \$10,000 a year, and good for three years. This better reflects the costs incurred by the City, should there be a problem with a road-cut where they would need to go back in the future to fix it.

Insurance requirements: Currently, the City only requires \$250,000 for liability insurance; they are proposing on this fee schedule maintained through the Mayor, that it be adjusted to reflect actual costs. What they are proposing is to increase the liability insurance to \$1 million, which is standard right now with liability insurance.

When people come in to take out a permit to excavate, the City is currently charging only \$90.00; this is supposed to cover the cost of the asphalt, and the time and materials; rather than specifying a certain dollar amount, they are proposing that this schedule can be adjusted to reflect the actual time and material costs. Over the past year, asphalt costs have gone from \$30.00 to \$60.00, and now it is back down to \$40.00; these fees will fluctuate, and it is difficult to come before the Council each time they need to change that fee, so if they can have a schedule that is approved through the Mayor's Office and adjusted to reflect the actual costs, that provides the flexibility for the City to react to the market and the costs.

The Ordinance amendment elements specific reference to specific fees, and will say that the fees will be kept to a schedule, approved by the Mayor; the City Engineering Department will work with the Mayor's Office to adjust that schedule from time to time, to reflect the actual current costs.

Mr. Hill stated that they have shared this information with the utility companies; most of them are the ones that do most of the excavation work in the public right-of-ways, so they are aware of this; he has spoken to a few of them about it, and he assumes there are no major concerns on what they are proposing in the fact that they are not in attendance, nor expressed any concerns to him.

Mr. Dredge clarified: the schedule will simply show the current costs of time and materials.

Mr. Hill stated that is correct. If specific prices change, the schedule would be amended to reflect that, once the Mayor approves the change.

Ms. Dunn made a motion to amend the Ordinance.
Mr. Robertson 2nd the motion

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales:

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed 4-0

3. **Review the Final Report of the Murray City Housing Market Study.**

Staff presentation: Tim Tingey, Economic & Community Development Director.

Mr. Tingey introduced Heidi Agler and Jason Stier from BBC Research and Consulting; the City embarked upon this study in January; it was funded through the CDBG program, and there were three main purposes of why they wanted this study done: They wanted to understand our housing needs, especially for the low to moderate income families and residents of the community.

The last study that was done, was done through the City's General Plan, and this study really focused on what the housing elements are in our community, and what we need to do to address issues for housing. In addition, it meets the requirement of the State, outline in the State Code, that the City provide a bi-annual report of our housing and how we are addressing the needs of low to moderate income families. The study also helps us as we look to move forward in some of our funding programs such as the Community Development Block Program, and our Redevelopment Agency funds, that are set aside for housing issues.

Ms. Agler stated that they took a typical approach to a housing study, and spoke with Mr. Tingey extensively about what the City's needs have been in the past, and what would be the best scope of work for the City. The first element of the report is a demographic, economic and housing profile of who lives in the city, what their incomes are, what their household composition is like, and what the employment situation is here in the City.

They conducted a housing market analysis, where they use a modeling effort to compare the supply of different price point housing in the City, divide that between rental and home-owner housing, with demand and what people can afford. They held two stake holder discussions: one with the development community, the other with a non-profit housing and social services committee, to talk to them about the primary needs within Murray City. They sent out a resident survey and asked residents to comment on their housing needs, and received a

phenomenal response of more than 400 people. Finally, they put together their findings and recommendations for how to address needs.

Demographics: the population of Murray City as of the 2007, was approximately 45,000. Murray is small for Salt Lake County, making up less than 5% of the County. Murray's growth rate between 2000 and 2007 was more than double of the rest of the County, a lot of that due to the annexations, new residential, and because of new residents moving into the City. The future growth is expected to be far slower than the County overall, primarily because there is not a lot of land to continue to grow onto, and a lot of opportunity for annexation; they compared population levels and growth in the report between 2000 and 2007, as well as the City's growth rate.

The median family income, in 2007, was \$60,000, the median household income was \$51,000; the difference in median family and median household incomes is that median household includes single people, and people who are living with roommates, where median family is defined as people who are related and living together. In general, median household income is always lower than median family because they pick up more one-earner households, or people who are retired and living on fixed incomes. About one in five households in Murray City earned less than \$25,000 and the poverty level is approximately 9.7%, which is the same as the State. The report shows poverty by age group; compared to many of the other cities for which they have done reports, Murray's poverty level for children is quite low; they usually see that rate at between 30 and 35%; in general, in most communities, about 1/3 of children live in poverty, but in Murray that does not hold true, and she complimented the City for that. The City's poverty rate, in general, is fairly low relative to most areas in which she works.

The employment levels throughout the nation is up, as it is in Murray City; the City had almost a zero level in 2008, from an economists perspective, at 2.8%; the latest number as of January, 2009, is at 4.9%. Although that rate has increased, the good news is that the city started at such a low level that this increase can be weathered much easier than a community that started at 5% and is now at 8% moving towards 10%.

The City also has robust industries, when they look at the primary employment industries such as educational services, health care and social services, retail trade, and professional and managerial professions. In particular, professional and managerial professions are in a high paying industry that has been affected a bit by the recession, but not as much as retail trade and services; we know that the health care profession, which is a core industry here, is expected to grow in the future. Murray should have a better opportunity of making it through the recession and weathering the storm as other communities, and the employment projection for top industries in the County has a very high projection for health care.

The median home price in 2007 was \$209,500, the median rent was \$771.00 per month. Murray City has one of the highest median values in the County; if they compare that to the median rent, the rent falls in the middle, giving the sense that it may be harder to buy a home in Murray, than it is to find an affordable rental; they look at the proportions of households that spend more than 30% of their income in housing costs. 36% of the households with a mortgage in Murray pay more than 30% of their income in housing costs, comparing with 37% of renters; they usually see the rental cost burden much higher than homeowners, and the City is about equal, which tells them that it is harder to afford a home to buy in Murray, than a home to rent and that it is harder to buy here than in many other communities.

They also did a gap analysis, where they compare supply and demand for renters, and found that 600 renters in Murray cannot afford affordable homes and are paying more than they can afford for housing. That is a pretty small number, but they would really like to see that lowered, so that there are fewer families that are at risk of homelessness or struggling on a regular basis to make ends meet. The report shows the gaps, and the highest gaps are at the lowest income level.

The home ownership gap is done by looking at the renters and take the proportion of units available (detached, condos, town homes, multi-family units for sale). They asked how many of those units can you buy, what proportion of the market is affordable to renters at different income levels; renters wanting to buy must earn at least \$50,000 per year, before more than ½ of the condos and town homes for sale are affordable. If a renter is looking for a detached single-family home, they must be earning at least \$75,000 per year before ½ of those homes are affordable. That is a high income level, especially if you are thinking about people operating from one income families.

Given all of this analysis and data, we think about what the future means for the City of Murray; they know what the City's needs are for today, but what does this mean down the road, especially as the economy recovers? They know that population growth will significantly slow, as there is no room to grow; between 2007 and 2060, according to the state demographer projections, Murray will add approximately 32,000 residents, or a growth rate of about 600 per year. The City will need to serve a larger number of elderly and disabled residents, as the City will continue to age and plateau; they know that people who are elderly have a much higher incidence rate of disability and you are not going to have that number of young people moving into the city as you would with a higher growth area, to support those aging residents and bring down the age distribution. As the overall population of the nation grows older, additional full time health care and service workers will be needed to deal with the increased demand for their skills, this bodes well for Murray City.

As such, the employment outlook for Murray looks good; however, housing your future workers, except for those in professional services, high paying managerial professions, is going to be quite challenging. There really isn't a lot to offer in future single family home ownership, especially when they look at detached, single-family homes.

That being said, Ms. Agler complimented the City for all that it has done around redevelopment, looking at the housing needs in this level of detail. It is nice to work with such a progressive city, and she feels that the City is really ahead of the curve, with an interest in housing its workers, made great strides in redevelopment and the City has a great future.

Mr. Tingey stated that as the City moves forward, they have to look at a number of different things; the City has funding sources that will be coming on-line; the Smelter site overlay district in tax increment financing, the redevelopment area will have some funding available, the CDBG program will have funding available, and really, what they want to do, but will not occur overnight, is to start taking steps forward to address these housing issues.

Mr. Tingey said that the first goal that they are looking at is to develop programs to increase home ownership opportunities for low to moderate income households, and to increase the supply of affordable houses. The key component of all of this is our objective to consider establishing a housing non-profit that focuses on Murray City. Right now, we give a number of CDBG funds to different organizations that serve the entire county; focusing our efforts on establishing a non-profit for Murray will allow us to develop additional programs, additional funding sources, leverage our funds with other potential funding sources, and establish a non-profit that will help address our housing needs, improving neighborhoods and do a variety of other things.

Once we look into endorsing this plan, we would go into a feasibility study to look at what is going to take to establish this non-profit, and then define the principle roles of the organization; get key groups involved, as it would not only be the City behind this. Hopefully, we will have the banking industry, businesses, and residents; this will help us in implementation of some of these programs; whether it is housing rehab program, a new construction program, these are the types of projects and programs that they will work towards.

They will utilize CDBG and tax increment financing funds for land acquisition and affordable housing. They will be able to look at acquiring property, land banking the property, and then have it for future needs for housing and development by this non-profit organization.

The second item is to improve housing quality for home owners in Murray;

developing and offering a home ownership housing rehabilitation program; when the study talks about 1/5 of the housing was developed prior to 1960, our housing stock is getting older and there is a need for a rehabilitation program. Working through this non-profit, they can help facilitate and administer this program; they will define the criteria and partner with this non-profit, they will allocate TIF and CDBG funds, and look at leveraging other funds. When they speak of a housing rehabilitation program, they are thinking of a loan program where it will revolve back so that they can assist property owners down the line. They will also look at developing density bonus programs, which they have some already adopted in the City Code, but they will look at enhancing and modifying those to facilitate more in that area.

Thirdly, they will increase efforts to address rental needs in the community, particularly for low to moderate income renters; they will continue to work with groups that they are involved with currently, to reduce or eliminate the rental gap. They will work and support the Section 8 housing voucher program with the Salt Lake County Housing Authority, to do all that they can to insure that policies are adopted or implemented both at the Federal, State and local levels to address the needs for rental housing and subsidies. They will also look at the Good Landlord Program and other potential programs to enhance the rental housing needs.

Finally, increase landlord and resident awareness and knowledge of housing issues in Murray. They want to educate people, help them understand more about housing and what programs are available to them; they want to talk about fair housing with landlords and make sure, at least in Murray, that people are educated on what the laws say about fair housing and other issues.

These are the goals, objectives and outputs that they are looking at. They are not asking the Council to endorse this tonight, they will be finalizing the report; they have the study finalized and will finalize the report that will go to the State, then come back and request the endorsement on that. Then they will look at implementing this over the next few months, years, if they receive the endorsement. They are very excited over this, especially the housing non-profit; they feel like it is a great opportunity to get an organization that can leverage other sources, that the City is behind, helping residents and focusing on our neighborhoods and residents, and really helping to address our housing issues in the community.

Ms. Dunn stated that this is very exciting; these are things that the Council has been talking about for a long time, and this gives it some direction.

4. **Consider an Amendment to the Reimbursement Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City (“RDA”) and Murray City Corporation (“City”) relating to power line relocation.**

Staff presentation: Tim Tingey, Economic & Community Development Director

Mr. Tingey stated that the City entered into an agreement with the Redevelopment Agency to relocate power lines in the Fireclay area for a Hamlet Development which was going to occur. That development has been put on hold; the agreement outlined that the work would be done within six months. It is not feasible to move forward with this at this time because they are not sure what the development will be or what the capacity for the power lines will need to be once they are relocated.

They are amending the agreement to allow them to proceed, once the RDA has a project in place and moving forward. The staff is recommending modification to this agreement.

Mr. Robertson made a motion to approve the amendment..

Ms. Griffiths 2nd the motion

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales:

 A Mr. Robertson

 A Ms. Griffiths

 A Ms. Dunn

 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed 4-0

5. **Consider a Resolution approving an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between the City and the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City regarding the Downtown Historic Area.**

Staff presentation: Tim Tingey, Economic & Community Development Director.

Mr. Tingey stated that the Redevelopment Agency has made a motion to approve this agreement; the purpose of this, for the public, is that the City has been moving forward on plans to enhance the downtown, focusing efforts on reestablishing a vision, setting goals, to more fully utilize our downtown and to make it an area much more pedestrian friendly, dense, and make it a destination area.

It has been a big process, that will need a number of groups involved, to make it

successful. The RDA and the City will need to take the lead in this, along with private investors, and the focus of this agreement is to define the roles of both organizations.

There are three elements discussed in the agreement: the planning, the organizational oversight, and the financing. These three elements are how we are going to proceed with this, making this development possibility a reality. Based on all of this, the staff recommends approval on this agreement.

Ms. Dunn made a motion to adopt the Resolution.
Ms. Griffiths 2nd the motion

Ms. Dunn made a motion to adopt the Resolution.
Ms. Griffiths 2nd the motion

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales:

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed 4-0

Ms. Griffiths added that this is another good product of teamwork between our Attorney's Office and the Community Development Office, and thanked them.

G. MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Snarr noted that last week, General Growth Properties filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection. He has been assured that this will be "business as usual" for the shoppers at the mall; General Growth has basically asked their creditors for some breathing room until they come up with a plan to reorganize the company. They have become highly leveraged in their dealings, and they are doing fine here and are looking for the additional funding resources to finish what they have started at the mall. Dillard's is currently on hold, as is the demolition of the Nordstroms. They have a beautiful water feature out there that has not been finished, which will possibly end up being a flower feature. They are hoping to get the construction fencing down soon to make it more attractive.

The Mayor stated that on the realignment of 300 West, financially, they have decided to pull off the project, after they finish the realignment. The one portion that they won't finish is the traffic signal there; but the realignment will alleviate a lot of the traffic congestion that was there before where the road T-boned into Winchester. They said they would be done in a couple of weeks.

H. QUESTIONS OF THE MAYOR

Ms. Dunn asked if there would be any traffic signal there at all. The Mayor stated that it used to be a three-way stop, and now it will be a four-way stop.

Ms. Wells stated that they may have to do a warrant study on that area, to see if warrants a light; and they will push for that.

The Mayor said that much of the reason behind this is that they will have to come back to do the signal for the rail line. They are not having the rail line come out differently until the Mid-Jordan spur is completed, but you can see where the new line is laid in that area. They feel that it will be another year or year and a half until that is done.

ADJOURNMENT