



## MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL WORKSHOP

The Murray City Municipal Council met for a workshop on Thursday, February 20, 2020, in Conference Room #101, at 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

### Council Members in Attendance:

Dale Cox - Chair	District #2
Rosalba Dominguez – Vice Chair	District #3
Kat Martinez	District #1
Diane Turner,	District #4
Brett Hales	District #5

### Others in Attendance:

Jan Lopez	Council Director	Pattie Johnson	Council Office
G.L. Critchfield	City Attorney	Doug Hill	Mayor's CAO
Jennifer Heaps	Chief Communications Officer	Bruce Turner	Resident
Brent Barnett	Resident	Jim Brass	Resident
Jennifer Brass	Resident	Allison Trease	NeighborWorks
David Moffit	NSL (NeighborWorks Salt Lake)		

**Call to Order** - Council Chair Cox called the Council Workshop to order at 1:00 p.m. and welcomed all.

**Discussion** – City Attorney, G.L. Critchfield

- **Power Department Governance**

This discussion was due to questions about governance of the Murray Power Department related to policies and procedures. Mr. Critchfield explained different types of business models used for power departments in general. For example, Rocky Mountain Power Company is investor owned, and entirely different than Murray City Power. He noted various ways governance policies are set up for municipalities and explained Murray City chose that the Murray City Power company would be considered a department within City operations, like any other department. He said there is no difference in the way the Murray Council governs the power department, and the way they govern the Murray City Attorney's office, or Murray Public Works Department; it is all set up the same.

A memo was noted to review general governance policies addressed in State Law and City Code; written on April 6, 2017, from former City Attorney, Frank Nakamura to Ms. Turner, titled: Governance

Policies for the Murray Power Department. Mr. Critchfield confirmed current information to clearly define areas the Council has input, which is equivalent to that of other departments, whether it be advice and consent, or procurement. In addition, City Code Chapter 15.20 - Electric Regulations, was reviewed to address the City Council's responsibilities related to Power Fund standards.

Ms. Turner noted a Power Advisory Board in the past was terminated, who gathered information from power staff, synthesized it, and made recommendations the City Council. Mr. Critchfield agreed the voluntary board made up of citizens, and included engineers, and technical professionals who would make recommendations to the Council for consideration related city ordinances. He confirmed the board was removed, but now the same information comes directly from power department staff.

Ms. Turner thought without help from the advisory board, responsibility to validate staff information fell directly on Council Members now; she wanted to ensure the Council understood well all technical matters in a comprehensive manner. Mr. Critchfield said whether information was attained from a board, or director, or power staff, the Council must comprehend issues to make effective decisions. Ms. Turner thought without an advisory board Council Members would have detailed questions.

Mr. Cox said the role of the Council Members had not changed; only the source providing information changed; he said it was no different than hearing from any other department director. Mr. Critchfield agreed.

Mr. Hales noted the Murray Power Department staff manages a much larger budget, not comparable to other departments, and he was confident in their reporting.

Ms. Turner asked about policies and procedures that apply to the Council. Mr. Critchfield confirmed they were all identified in the current ordinance. However, he said the Murray Power Department has its own operational policies and procedures. Therefore, it was important to clarify that the Council's policy function is separate from operational responsibilities of the power department.

- **Social Media Policy**

Mr. Critchfield noted two aspects of social media use related to elected officials; dos and don'ts of participating; and handling comments made by others on personal feed. He explained there are various social media policies in place for elected officials throughout the country; as for individual Council Members, the most important part of utilizing social media is whether to manage a private or public account. When a public site is used for personal public business, the act of campaigning, should never occur there. Private accounts should be kept to a select number of friends; if a friend request is accepted from a stranger, who comments or posts questions about public and city issues, the account automatically becomes a public forum.

Mr. Critchfield reviewed the current Murray Social Media Policy (See Attachment #1). He advised Council Members to establish a process for responding to public related comments on private accounts; and suggested a social media policy be created just for the City Council, so matters are handled appropriately.

He warned the public does not always make the correct distinction between Council Members- as a

group; a Council Member- as an individual; or the Mayor, or the entire City. For many, the City is the City, whether a comment comes from one Council Member, or the Mayor's office - people consider messages as though all opinions come from one entity- Murray City.

He advised when using any social media, Council Members should make it clear that comments are personal views, as opposed to speaking on behalf of the City Council as a whole. He stressed a Council policy would provide clear guidelines. He said posts to discuss city issues on private accounts should not happen, and to keep in mind that legally every record, including council computer files, letters and social media comments, can be considered public documentation - if a violation occurs. For example, when a Council Member makes a post on social media, and other Council Members comment on that feed, it becomes a public record. This can create a concern, which means there is a time frame that the conversation can be publically requested to determine whether a violation of the Public Meetings Act occurred.

He discussed obstinate and offense comments, and said when an account is public blocking people for that reason is prohibited. He said there was virtually no difference between that, and a Council Member asking a person to leave a public meeting; a Council Member would never ask them to leave the room because of an opposing public comment. Therefore, Council Members may not block people on social media. He advised they not link private accounts to the City website, or emails, and not invite people during public meetings to privately discuss matters later in private social accounts.

Mr. Hales stated he is active on social media and he enjoys these connections. However, he makes it a practice to never discuss politics in those spaces. He confirmed when friends comment or ask political questions or comment on city issues, he does not engage.

Ms. Turner said even though a personal account is in the public domain, comments and conversations held there cannot be used in a court of law. Mr. Critchfield explained State law casts a large net on the matter; so, if a conversation appears to be in violation, it is conceivable that private account conversations could be accessed to obtain that proof. However, if private accounts are utilized appropriately for personal use, and not related to city issues, there is no concern.

Ms. Martinez uses all social media, private and publically. She asked whether conversations on her personal account - not related to City Council issues were appropriate; for example, a discussion about City school curriculums. Mr. Critchfield said conversations like those are appropriate; his main concern is not having policy discussions on private pages. She affirmed it was appropriate to have a separate social media account for campaigning. Mr. Critchfield agreed.

Ms. Dominguez asked if it was acceptable to block a person on social media, due to personal safety concerns. Mr. Critchfield said as long as fears are justifiable.

- **Lyme Scooter Agreement**

Mr. Critchfield provided back ground information that evolved over the last year related to how and why Murray could become involved with scooter businesses. He said scooters are showing up in Murray Park and around the City lately, due to scooter companies that allow scooters to be dropped off in any City - without a City's consent.

He said various companies approached Murray to inquire about the City participating, but clarified what companies are really asking is to operate business within Murray City rights-of-way. They want permission to park scooters on sidewalks, and in city public parks. He said this is significant because Murray does not allow business to be conducted in rights-of-way spaces. If allowed, it would create a shift in City policy because two elements would need to be regulated – scooters, and the scooter companies. For instance, riders of scooters must be treated the same as bicycle riders; therefore, regulations would need to be scrutinized; and State Law allows the City to regulate companies, but there is no established guidance afterwards.

The business Lyme approached Murray when a countywide Legislative task force was formed; Salt Lake City proceeded to contract with Lyme, where scooter operation is in full swing within the County. Murray held off on a decision at that time. Mr. Critchfield explained since Salt Lake City was not familiar with this type of business overall, an agreement was devised to detail how operations would run, and that a portion of driver's fees are paid to the city.

Murray looked at Salt Lake City's agreement to compare what would be best for Murray. After much discussion, and revisions, Murray created the same type of Interim Operating Agreement, which would take the place of an ordinance. A review of the current agreement was conducted, which Lyme wants to see approved. He said since it is a City-wide issue the agreement is considered policy; the Council would consider whether to move it forward in a future council meeting.

Mr. Critchfield said Murray Risk Manager, Mr. Knight attended a conference to attain information regarding insurance coverage related to the activity, where it was suggested the City not participate, due to a vast number of associated injuries that are typical.

Ms. Dominguez asked who is liable for injuries and accidents. Mr. Critchfield said claims could come back on the City because the City would be allowing the business to operate here; so, legally Murray could be involved. He said injuries are only one factor of concern, and if the City wants to move forward with a temporary agreement, best practices suggest other safety measures be included. He asked Council Members to review the agreement in detail, and accumulate questions for Lyme, who would come to present more business details in the future.

The council discussed the matter: Mr. Hales agreed scooters remain about St. George City. Ms. Martinez agreed Sugar House experienced the same thing, and near the University of Utah. Ms. Turner said scooters are dropped along sidewalks where citizens trip on them. Mr. Critchfield noted scooters are not picked up the moment they are dumped, although, the agreement would require a time frame that companies must collect them from Murray sidewalks and parks. Ms. Dominguez thought parking stations would be helpful, noted the weight of heavy scooters; and wondered about current claims with Lyme, due to scooters being left in ADA areas. Mr. Cox thought the best practice would be to limit the City's liability, as much as possible. Ms. Martinez favors active transportation, thought education would be imminent to improve scooter use, hoped challenging problems could be resolved; and asked if sales tax revenue would be generated.

To ensure scooters would be safe, Ms. Turner addressed faulty scooters. She did not see elements in the agreement related to safety requirements that ensure safe scooters to prevent accidents. She

thought records of safety inspections should be required, along with mandatory maintenance schedules; she requested those items be added to the agreement to hopefully reduce injury, due to lack of upkeep.

Mr. Critchfield concluded scooter use is popular all over the country; there would be risk, so as policy makers the Council should carefully review the agreement to consider the full impact. He agreed blocking ADA access was concerning, and was unaware of any Lyme related claims. He confirmed revenue would result from fees but was uncertain of the amount. He reiterated a temporary agreement was better than having an ordinance, to which he would add the safety requirements requested by Ms. Turner. Having scooters available near Murray TRAX stations would benefit employees of the hospital, college students of the Steven Henagar campus, and residents in that area.

- **Plastic Bag Ordinance**

Whether the City or stores could charge fees for using plastic grocery bags was discussed. Mr. Critchfield said Murray should not be compared to other cities who banned plastic bags because Murray is considerably different, and cities had justifiable reasons. He clarified Park City, is a resort destination; Moab, is a tourist town, and Logan, a pristine northern green valley community. Details were highlighted:

- Park City – First in Utah to ban plastic grocery bags. Only three stores considered large contributors; so the ban only applies to those three stores and no other retail businesses. No fee or tax is involved because the State Legislature has not authorized such a tax. One store charges a 10-cent fee to make up for costs associated with providing paper sacks; Park City did not impose the fee, the store did it voluntarily.
- Logan – The ban is not in effect until July 2020. No fee will charged because Cache County is considering its own environmental management plan in the future. As a result, Cache County would impose related fees, if any. Logan City owns a landfill where plastic bags are a great nuisance, so imposing the restriction was more defensible.
- Moab – The town is at the center of many National parks.

Mr. Critchfield confirmed all three cities had good justification in support of their ordinances. He explained Murray cannot charge a tax for using plastic bags; it must be authorized by State Legislation; and it is difficult to distinguish between a fee and a tax. He read Utah Supreme Court guidelines regarding taxes and fees to show the bag fee is used to defray a regulation, and that is: “the amount of the bag fee bares the necessary relationship to the cost of regulation.” He stressed Murray would have no way of determining what that cost would be – so it would default to a tax implementation, which the City cannot impose. He said if the City moves forward with the ordinance, it would be only to ban bags; a fee must be left out, unless a specific study equates the amount charged to the bags that are used.

He proposed that if the City passed fee implementations on to grocery stores, it would amount to delegating a public function, to a private entity. He explained what other states did to ban plastic bags, was to mandate that stores charge a 10-cent fee, which they kept. Mr. Critchfield is not comfortable with Murray delegating legislative authority, however, if stores want to implement those fees that is fine.

Ms. Turner confirmed stores can charge fees if desired. Mr. Critchfield said this is what Park City did, and reported stores like Kroger have plans to phase plastic bags out voluntarily, in about 3-5 years.

Mr. Cox observed cashiers now often ask customers whether they want a plastic bag or not- so bags can be refused. He agreed Murray is far different from Park City, due to a higher number of retail stores using plastic bags; not only grocery stores, retailers in the mall, numerous gas stations, and restaurants also use them for take home food.

Ms. Turner thought the ordinance provided a way to address mall stores. Mr. Critchfield confirmed the proposed Murray ordinance applies to plastic bags across the board of retail - all businesses are affected. The ordinance is specific to certain types of plastic bags; for example, plastic bags used for packaging processed meats and bulk foods do not apply in the ordinance.

Mr. Cox said the ordinance must make sense to all retailers in Murray, and ways to work with Fashion Place Mall must be identified. Mr. Critchfield thought more input was needed from the public; not just in a public hearing, and more input from actual retailers. He said Park City began investigating all ramifications prior to 2011, where much research was conducted before they passed an ordinance; also, Logan took a long time passing an ordinance, clearly researching actual numbers of those involved with retail, and getting more public opinion, which is essential.

Ms. Turner said banning plastic bags makes sense to the environment. Ms. Dominguez agreed and led a brief discussion about other cities in the area also considering a plastic bag ban. Ms. Martinez thought it might be easier to phase in a plastic bag ban at the same time Kroger phases them out. Mr. Cox agreed. Mr. Critchfield said it is an easier proposition if the justification, in part, was greater. Therefore, using the environment as the only reason for Murray to ban bags was hard to justify. He said it would be easier to validate if Murray had landfill issues similar to Logan. And for example, if all seven member cities of Trans Jordan Landfill exclude plastic bags all together, Murray's ban would be more permissible.

Ms. Dominguez discussed about recycling and the need for updated extensive educational programs. She thought many do not participate, but a larger population was supportive. She noted Murray falls low on the list comparatively for successful recycling, and there was no one solution for addressing plastic bags; therefore, education about landfill issues should reach every citizen. Being present in the public eye, conducting active hands-on programs and organized physical events are needed, which prove more effective than dialogue in meetings; for example, visiting schools to teach proper procedures. She said changing behavior is key - as she witnessed in California during their process to ban them; people who believed plastic bags were a commodity, adapted fine. Mr. Hales has used reusable bags for many years, and favored new educational ideas. He noted recycling instruction pamphlets placed inside utility bills, and guidelines listed inside recycling containers were useful education tools. Ms. Turner confirmed educational pieces were published in the Murray Journal, along with other articles; and monthly notices went out to citizens about proper recycling. She said recycling is so specific now, and expensive, which is part of the problem, so eliminating plastic bags would solve many of those challenges.

Ms. Martinez proposed 3-5 years seemed lengthy for Kroger stores to phase out plastic bags, but was

possibly due to using up inventory. She supports helping the environment locally, and agreed long term education programs are needed, just like current water conservation and fire safety programs in elementary schools. She said change can be made by educating children, and agreed proper sorting programs for recycling should be taught in schools. She suggested a catchy hashtag for posting pictures about using reusable bags to get the word out, at no cost. She requested a firm timeline to get that accomplished, so residents would know the City is mindful of the challenge. She thought there would come a time to pass an ordinance in the future to help many comply.

Ms. Turner said her constituents initially did not like the idea- but would adapt.

Mr. Cox noted during the last plastic bag meeting, public opinion was split; many constituents in other Murray districts were undecided. He agreed promoting reusable bags should be encouraged, but not with a heavy hand.

- **NeighborWorks Board Advice and Consent**

Mr. Critchfield discussed the Council's role in advice and consent related to the Mayor's proposed representative for the NeighborWorks Board. There was a question about the matter when the item was pulled from a recent council meeting agenda, so the Council did not vote on it.

Mr. Critchfield explained while drafting the resolution for the City to enter into an interlocal agreement with NeighborWorks, an error was discovered. Reading language from City Code, Chapter 2.51 Section Title: Appointment of Representatives to Governing Boards of Interlocal Entities, he noted the City is a member of 12 interlocal entities. When he read the NeighborWorks agreement; the organization states it is a 'private non-profit organization' incorporated in the State of Utah. Therefore, NeighborWorks is not an interlocal entity – and should not have been listed in this section of City Code. He did not know why, how, or when the error occurred.

He deciphered an interlocal entity is one the City chose to part of by agreement; for instance, as with UAMPS (Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems), and VECC, (Valley Emergency Communications Center), and UTOPIA – all with statutory boards. He said the City joined with these separate entities, as either a member, or part owner; and all are part of Murray operations. He explained agreements like these are completely different than the agreement and relationship the City has with NeighborWorks. NeighborWorks is a private 501 (c)(3) organization of Salt Lake City; not an interlocal entity. That is why he proposed the Council should not weigh-in on an agreement of this type.

Mr. Critchfield analyzed both forms of government statutes in State law regarding advice and consent. He noted State Code, Section 10-3b-2021D, and explained, due to separation of powers, and Murray's form of government – the Council's extent of advice and consent does not address nonprofit entities. He clarified if city staff is to be on the NeighborWorks Board, it only occurs by agreement, and the agreement sets forth what the City will do, which is to maintain current membership on the board of directors.

He said fundamentally the separation of powers within Murray's form of government should be considered; there are legislative functions, made by the Council; and administrative functions, decided by Mayor Camp. He said the current agreement– is really an RDA (Redevelopment Agency)

agreement, however, both the City and the RDA are required to participate. When originally drafted, the current ordinance included just one entity - the City, or the RDA; legally, the City cannot obligate the RDA to act in a particular way, and the RDA cannot obligate on behalf of the City. It must be Council Members working with the proper hat on when approving this type of agreement.

He explained when former Governor Leavitt gave his State of the State Address, he proposed that cities ensure 20% of funds be earmarked for affordable housing in RDA areas. Therefore, it was determined, with council approval at that time, to enter an agreement through NeighborWorks to achieve that.

In conclusion, Mr. Critchfield said when looking at the agreement it is clear the issue at hand is an administrative function; the City agreed to be involved with NeighborWorks, and agreed how the Council would be involved, and it was time to act accordingly. Ultimately, deciding who will serve on the NeighborWorks Board is a function of the administrative, which is not a statutory board, so consequently it becomes a decision made by Mayor Camp alone.

Ms. Turner asked if the City was involved with other entities having similar boards like this one. Mr. Critchfield was uncertain. Mr. Hill commented Mayor Camp appointed Ms. Kennedy to the CAP (Community Action Program) Board, which is not a statutory board, and others like IPA (Intermountain Power Agency), WFRC (Wasatch Front Regional Council), and CVWRF (Central Valley Water Reclamation Facility) all require interlocal agreements.

Ms. Dominguez wondered as the Murray RDA, what the Council's function and roll is with NeighborWorks. Mr. Critchfield said the agreement states two contact representatives are set in place: CED Director, Ms. Greenwood; and Maria Garcia, with Murray NeighborWorks. He stressed these two representatives would attend regular monthly NeighborWorks board meetings; Council Members are not required to attend, because issues discussed are not legislative in nature; and the Mayor delegated that duty to his staff.

Ms. Turner asked if Council Members could attend NeighborWorks board meetings, due to mere interest. Mr. Critchfield replied yes, as many as they wanted, but to keep in mind Council Members are not appointed representatives; he reiterated that responsibility is an administration function.

Mr. Cox confirmed NeighborWorks was written into the current ordinance. Mr. Critchfield confirmed in error; he stated it was an improper illegal ordinance that cannot be enforced. He elaborated it cannot be said that since NeighborWorks is written there, it is now an interlocal entity – it is not; NeighborWorks should be removed from the ordinance.

Ms. Dominguez affirmed since NeighborWorks was written into the current ordinance, was there any recourse for the Council at this time. Mr. Critchfield noted according to State law advice and consent from the Council are only required on specific appointments, such as, department heads, statutory officers, and statutory board members; he said the error must be corrected.

Ms. Turner asked Mr. Critchfield to define advice and consent, as it works in Murray's form of governing. He said 'advice and consent' is a type of legal term, when proposed legislation is not approved, and legislation fails, the Mayor must return to the Council with a new proposal. The term



only means the Council either approves or disapproves proposed legislation.

Mr. Hales affirmed the Murray City Council approved the initial agreement long ago. Mr. Critchfield confirmed. Mr. Hales agreed his advice was never requested on legislative matters. Ms. Turner thought the 'advice' piece of that language was not clear.

Mr. Hales stated the topic was under examination and the error discovered due to the appointment matter, and having the item pulled from the agenda. He explained the proposal may not have gone through, and Council Members did not have the chance to vote on it. He expressed frustration that it was now discovered that Council approval was not necessary.

Ms. Dominguez asked at what point the Council could have followed the current ordinance as is- with NeighborWorks included. Mr. Critchfield said only when it is lawful; taking advantage of a mistake in an ordinance should never happen. He said one cannot take an administrative function and make it a legislative function just because someone wants to.

Ms. Turner confirmed the Council was not aware of the error until now, and they planned on voting on the items during the scheduled council meeting.

Mr. Hales thought the Mayor must not have been aware of the error either - or he would not have presented it to the council for consideration in the first place.

A review of City Code Chapter 2, Number 11 - "Powers and Duties" was reviewed. Mr. Critchfield read specifically, that: "the Council gives advice and consent to the Mayor on all proposed appointments of city department directors, statutory officers, boards, commissions, committees or bodies established to provide advice or assistance to the operations of the City." He stressed this is not what NeighborWorks was established for, which is why the error is valid. Ms. Turner said having the clarified information was helpful. Mr. Cox wondered how long the error had been in place. Ms. Lopez perceived approximately 10 years.

Mr. Brass commented City Code was written as such, based on the Fireclay ordinance; citizens were tired of having apartment buildings constructed with low income housing money; so, an effort was made to save the Hanauer and Box Elder neighborhoods. A fund was created initially to do low interest loans, or provide forgiven loans to homeowners, and help elderly fix up old houses. The other reason was to do affordable mortgages for young families, so they could move back to Murray. It was agreed to include NeighborWorks as an RDA entity, and ultimately as a Council, and with former RDA Director, Mr. Tingey, NeighborWorks was brought up from Salt Lake, to join with the City and open their office on Poplar Street. He praised the organization, said it was a worthy business that spends a lot of money in Murray, so he hated to see the baby thrown out with the bath water. Mr. Cox agreed. Mr. Hales confirmed the biggest concern of the Council is to fully support NeighborWorks.

Ms. Dominguez said the Council connection to support NeighborWorks is important, and wants to see it further developed. She confirmed existing concerns about a proposed board representative, and thought attending NeighborWorks board meetings would help the Council, who often was unaware of information being shared, and not being shared. She said maintaining a strong alliance should be ensured because the Council also represents NeighborWorks in a manner - for all citizens.

Mr. Critchfield said the discussion was not whether the City would continue the NeighborWorks agreement relationship; the agreement would certainly move forward. He clarified the question is who has ultimate authority to appoint a NeighborWorks board member- which is the administration.

Mr. Cox asked Mr. Critchfield to fix the ordinance error accordingly. Mr. Critchfield confirmed he would clean up the language to make it lawful.

### **Travel Discussion**

- **APPA Travel 2020 and Future** - Dale Cox

Mr. Cox reported, due to cutbacks made by Mayor Camp, only two Council Members would be invited to attend the 2020 APPA (American Public Power Association) National Convention this year; paid for by the Murray City Power Department. Mr. Cox explained prior to the change all Council Members were invited to attend with the Mayor, and power department staff. The Power Department Travel Policy was reviewed.

Ms. Turner stated all power conventions are educational and beneficial; she confirmed all Council Members could still attend APPA; the Council budget could be utilized. Mr. Cox agreed

He confirmed all Council Members are invited to local UAMPS conventions, and said he was grateful to attend two APPA National Power Conventions, so far during his term. He agreed all power related conferences are helpful for understanding power related matters; for example, nuclear energy, and other things to come.

- **Council Travel Policy Revisions** - Janet Lopez

Ms. Lopez said the 2012 Murray City Council Travel Policy required updating, since practices were different from the policies. Mr. Critchfield confirmed changes would require Council approval during a future council meeting. Mr. Lopez explained changes to the following items:

- Conferences - Preapproved for Attendance by Council Members. New text includes the council director in attendance for specific conferences.
- NLC (National League of Cities) – All council members, and the council director, will be budgeted to attend one national meeting, per fiscal year. (Prior to the change, only two council members attended, alternating years.) Ms. Lopez explained changes were based on Mayor Camp's new policy for the City, regarding the APPA conference. As a result, for future attendance, three council members will be funded by the council budget; and two council members funded by the power budget.
- UAMPS August Conference – All council members to attend; funded by power budget.
- GSA Website (US General Services Admission) This is the standard used to determine per diem and mileage. Generally, conference registration, and mileage are paid in advance by the City;

often hotel and other expenses are paid by the council member at the time of check out and reimbursed, however, the City may pay this with a purchasing card, if notified.

Ms. Turner noted reimbursements for ground transportation. Ms. Lopez clarified Council per diem should be used for all travel expenses like taxi and Ubers. However, if an extensive distance is required for ground travel, or when personal cars are left at the airport while away, those charges would be reimbursed by the City – upon presentation of receipt.

- Meal Expenses – No reimbursements for day trips within 100 miles of the City. Ms. Lopez explained those charges should be covered by Council Members monthly expense allowance.

Ms. Martinez asked if updates were effective this year, with the exception of APPA travel allowance. Ms. Lopez confirmed, funding was not available this fiscal year for that.

- **Council Office Budget Priorities Fiscal Year 2020 - 2021** - Janet Lopez

- **Review Agenda Software Program**

Ms. Lopez provided a summary sheet and power point to discuss the possibility of attaining automated software that allows agenda documents to be compiled electronically; she learned other city council directors find the program useful, saving significant time on agenda preparation. She and Ms. Kennedy met with Granicus (a digital software company) to gain information and get cost estimates; the following cities also use Granicus: Salt Lake County, West Valley City, Riverton, Park City, Orem, and Sandy.

Ms. Lopez explained an app would be accessed by her, and all users including the administration and department heads. Software allows access for filling out council action forms, cover sheets, submitting background material, ordinances and resolutions; documents are downloaded online saving time. The preliminary agenda would go through the approval process as normal –by the mayor’s office, and templates would be provided. Items that cannot be in the public domain are marked as private. Once assembled, citizens can subscribe to receive the final agenda. Minutes processing are linked to video or audio, so particular items discussed are easily located by citizens and staff.

She displayed an example agenda to review the overall process. Ms. Lopez noted the process saves processing time as all assembly is handled online, where links are attached to open specific documents. Data is hosted on the domain of Granicus, so space is not utilized on the City Website or kept in Council files for documenting.

Mr. Cox affirmed there would be a public domain, and a staff domain. Ms. Lopez confirmed each item comes up individually, as previewed. She would like to contact two other organizations to gather more information, compare capabilities and determine costs; streaming video is also available. Granicus requires a onetime set up fee of \$4,500 including training; agendas and minutes management is approximately \$10,200 per year. Ms. Kennedy confirmed. Ms. Lopez said the program would involve input from IT, and Mayor Camp’s office prior to any final decision. She asked for Council thoughts.

Mr. Cox asked if companies prepare minutes. Ms. Lopez said they would provide only a link to access

minutes within the audio or visual segments. Minutes would be completed as they are now in the Recorder's office and Council office.

Ms. Turner thought it was a nice improvement. Ms. Lopez noted time saved on her part, as well as, in the Mayor's office because items go directly to the app for all to view at the same time.

Ms. Dominguez asked about links associated with YouTube, where meetings are currently viewed. Ms. Lopez explained a camera would still be operated. Ms. Kennedy said external links are bookmarked within videos and for accessing exact audio discussions.

Mr. Hales noted viewers could go directly to an agenda, find a discussion item, click on links and be directed to that portion of meeting - instead of forwarding through long videos. Ms. Lopez confirmed. There was consensus to move forward with more research and additional bids.

- **Budget Dates and Process** (Attachment 2)

Ms. Lopez reviewed the Fiscal Year 2020 – 2021 Budget process and dates calendar.

### **Council Member Initiatives**

- **Water Wise Landscaping on Park Strips** - Kat Martinez

Ms. Martinez noted the current landscape ordinance that states a required amount of vegetation must be included in park strips. She thought the ordinance was in conflict with what she sees planted and placed in Murray parking strips, such as grass replaced with other materials, like flower pots; therefore, she asked if ordinance language needed to be reworded so that citizens who follow the rule could transform parking strips accordingly. She requested a brief history to understand how the 'vegetation' text came about; and if there are better options than things that allow water to run off or be absorbed. She thought possibly sand, woodchips or other matter could be utilized for Water Wise.

Mr. Cox recalled Public Works Director, Mr. Astill, provided information to the Council recently, about an incentive for improving parking strips called "flipping the strip," which created a variety of change. Ms. Martinez was aware of incentives to come but was uncertain of that one.

Mr. Hill commented the City's water department would like to implement an incentive program into the next year's budget, and would work with the CED (Community and Economic Department), and City attorneys, to look at the ordinance and determine if restrictions make it difficult for home owners to convert grass to something else; he said the issue is on their project list.

Ms. Martinez looked forward to learning more, as material like wood chips, commonly seen, does not match the ordinance.

Mr. Cox noted many parking strips are full of weeds. He understood many projects take time, but due to the increased number of new homes construction in Murray, he thought this project should be a priority. It would save on landscaping expenses like running sprinkling systems under sidewalks and

out to parking strips.

Mr. Hill shared history about parking strips to confirm the vegetation requirement in the current ordinance. He noted the word vegetation, meaning not just grass; there can be xeriscaping and drought tolerant plants. He agreed the ordinance is not followed by citizens, and many parking strips are filled with concrete, and other materials not permitted.

He discussed how current language came about several years ago, due to a situation in the City. The ordinance had to be enforced when neighbors requested enforcement of a property owner who placed concrete and large boulders in all parking strip areas- to an extreme. As a result of the complaint, the City took action, however, the accused sought out over 100 other citizens also in violation. Mr. Hill said the City does not practice proactive enforcement, only reactive enforcement. So, the City had to decide whether to enforce the ordinance overall, or change it. During council meetings and several public meetings the City contemplated the ordinance – right or wrong – why have it if not enforced. He explained thoughts of the mayor, city council and attorneys at that time, were that it would be more challenging to patrol neighborhoods, take citizens to justice court for not having grass; make them tear out concrete, and spend thousands of dollars to replace it.

Mr. Hill continued the City did not want to appear as if the ordinance was irrelevant. So, a baseline was needed to make residents understand important City esthetics; the City wants trees in parking strips, as determined by the Shade Tree and Beautification Committee. Since material doesn't have to be grass, and there are many alternatives, it was decided not to eliminate specific wording from the ordinance because it will most likely not be enforced.

History shows the ordinance changed multiple times over 20 years, but is now more Water Wise friendly than ever; at one time only grass was allowed, then ten years ago the ordinance changed to include live vegetation. Mr. Hill agreed the ordinance requires policy discussion and he encouraged a future Committee of the Whole discussion with CED staff, the water department, and public works staff to gain a better perspective of what they deal with daily.

Mr. Hill said Public Works, Director, Mr. Astill hopes to allow parking strips with nothing but grass, be flipped to plant based landscapes. Currently, xeriscaping is not allowed, however, if that is desired, the City is willing to help financially, as it does with other programs. For example, with house fixtures that provide better water efficiency; the City contributes a certain dollar amount towards those costs. The intent is not to address new construction. He said the ordinance is good for those areas, because eliminating water in parking strips entirely is not effective for live vegetation and grass which is encouraged. The main focus is on older areas where grass can be changed to more efficient material.

Mr. Cox agreed and requested the discussion for a Committee of the Whole. Ms. Martinez was grateful to have a historical understanding and looked forward to the future discussion.

- **Trigger Locks** - Kat Martinez

Ms. Martinez said citizens in Salt Lake County may visit any county library and attain free trigger locks for guns, funded by the County. Ms. Martinez would like to see the City participate in the same manner. She said trigger locks are affordable, similar to bike locks, and would prevent guns from being

fired accidentally. Although the Murray police station currently offers similar locks, she would like to see them available at the Murray Library, and Park Center. Visible signage might encourage better gun safety since children are often involved in unintended gun accidents. Flyers could be displayed in specific areas to get patrons attention about trigger lock safety measures.

Ms. Turner asked the cost of a trigger lock. Ms. Martinez said approximately \$13 on Amazon, which is not a great impact to the City budget. She thought purchasing a dozen to begin with, would allow the City to discover how well the program is accepted.

Mr. Hales confirmed use of trigger locks is strictly voluntary. Ms. Martinez said 20,000 children under the age of five are hospitalized annually for unintentional gun fire, so it would be a great community safety initiative.

Mr. Brass shared an instance regarding his daughter, confirming that funding is available for trigger lock purchases.

Ms. Dominguez suggested the County might assist cities that want to purchase trigger locks.

Mr. Cox said contacting the County about their program would provide good direction. He encouraged communication with department heads first, to see if they are willing to run the program at those public facilities. Mr. Hill agreed he would contact Murray Library Director, Ms. Fong, and the Murray Library Board of Directors to relay the request. He explained from a government perspective, a decision to move forward with any program held at the Murray Library requires their decision, as a separate organization from City government; in addition the Library budget would need to be utilized.

Ms. Martinez would communicate with the County, contact Ms. Fong afterwards with details, and research funding possibilities, per Mr. Hill's instructions. Mr. Hill reported citizens can currently go to the IMC (Intermountain Medical Center) hospital and get free trigger locks at the pharmacy. Ms. Martinez appreciated that. Mrs. Dominguez suggested that information be shared more publically. Ms. Turner asked about the process to offer trigger locks at the Park Center. Mr. Hill would discuss the matter with Mayor Camp, and report back.

▪ **Short-Term Rentals** - Kat Martinez

Ms. Martinez reported a constituent was excited about short-term rentals. She realized Mayor Camp was working on the matter, however, she wanted to understand what other districts were experiencing.

Mr. Hales used short-term rentals in St. George and other places where he enjoys them; however, most constituents in his district do not support having them in City neighborhoods. He confirmed the Council would consider short-term rentals in a future council meeting, proposed by Mayor Camp.

Ms. Martinez asked if the City was currently in conflict with State Law. Ms. Lopez clarified State Law only says the City cannot prohibit home owners from advertising short-term rentals.

Mr. Hales confirmed nor can the City search out properties offering short-term rentals, thereby having

them cited. Mr. Critchfield confirmed the City did pass an ordinance saying it would be a crime to advertise - but people can have them. He said the difficulty lies with determining whether guests are actually renters, or relatives spending the night. Mr. Hill confirmed Mayor Camp recently spoke openly about short-term rentals, and stated the Mayor is working closely with CED staff to bring forward a new ordinance the Council would consider in the future.

Ms. Turner had no concerning conversations with her constituents about the matter. Ms. Martinez said she lives in area with other renters; she is accustomed to them, so her neighborhood does not feel disruptive. Ms. Lopez noted complaints surrounding short-term rentals are late night parties, extreme traffic, and parking up and down neighborhood streets. Ms. Dominguez reported a recent situation in District 1 that may have created current concerns, and was glad to know the item would be forthcoming for consideration. Ms. Martinez agreed.

- **Holiday Ordinance** - Dale Cox. Mr. Cox would address the matter at a later time.
- **Welcoming Babies Born at Intermountain Medical Center** - Rosalba Dominguez

Ms. Dominguez expressed her desire to establish a relationship with IMC hospital, by offering a simple 'Welcome to the World' notecard to babies born in Murray, from the Council. She said hospital baby gifts typically include a number of things, like education materials on breast feeding; welcome cards would go with that package sent home with babies. She could take on the project herself, if there was no Council interest, and noted minimal cost. She discussed the idea with Ms. Lopez prior and sought input from the Council.

Ms. Lopez said the project is big and buy-in from the hospital would be required; hospital staff would be responsible for handing cards out in a timely fashion. She confirmed hospital participation was key, because it would be challenging to keep up with preparing cards when necessary.

Ms. Turner asked who would be responsible overall. Ms. Dominguez would design cards that could be preprinted, and the hospital would have on hand. Ms. Turner asked if other cities do this. Ms. Dominguez thought the University of Utah gave similar gifts. Ms. Turner was aware of gifts from hospitals but not city officials.

Ms. Martinez thought printing might be costly, and much work was needed to keep the project up to date. She wondered how many Murray residents have babies at IMC. Mr. Cox asked how many babies are born daily at IMC. Ms. Dominguez appreciated the discussion would research further; she thought a personal gesture from the Murray Council would be sincere.

Mr. Critchfield advised State Law allows a city to spend money on certain purposes. However, when money is used for gifts to private entities or people, a council process is required. He said as any other type of gift the City Council must follow the required process during a council meeting. However, if Ms. Dominguez wants to pursue the project on her own, she may do that.

Mr. Cox agreed Ms. Dominguez should communicate further with the hospital, and gather detailed information about birth numbers, so the Council could discuss it more in the future.

Ms. Turner asked about work involving council staff. Ms. Dominguez said a box of cards would be supplied to hospital staff to distribute; and not much work is required by staff.

Ms. Martinez said it would be important to monitor cards, so cards do not end up sitting in closet not getting delivered. Ms. Dominguez would analyze those details.

▪ **Dog Park Discussion** - Rosalba Dominguez

Several constituents had inquired about a dog park in Murray after hearing something about it through the Murray Parks and Recreation Department. Ms. Dominguez hoped to respond to questions and comments such as, why Murray doesn't have a dog park; when the City can get one; and where and how a dog park would fit into Murray. She noted Taylorsville City's dog park, near the boundary of Murray, however, if non-residents utilize the park, they are fined.

Ms. Turner said Murray was not the only city without a dog park. Ms. Dominguez said Murray has a large population of dog owners, and many visited the Taylorsville dog park, with regret. Ms. Martinez wondered about forming a possible dog license amnesty program with Taylorsville to share visiting rights; she note Murray had nothing to offer in return. She thought licensing fees go towards park upkeep. Ms. Dominguez confirmed fines are warranted due to strict regulations.

Ms. Turner perceived all dog owners could use Taylorsville Dog Park. Mr. Cox confirmed fines are issued for dogs not licensed with Taylorsville City. Ms. Turner agreed a reciprocal agreement would benefit Murray dog owners.

Mr. Hales recalled the subject was addressed by Mr. Sorensen when he recently presented the draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan to the Council. Mr. Hill confirmed results of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan would be presented to the Council by the consultant. Approximately \$100,000 was spent to get the plan in place. Information was compiled from comprehensive public involvement, social group surveys, and pop-up events to collect data. He said all issues related to parks and recreation boil down to priorities of the people, whether it is skate parks, bowling greens, splash pads, better playground areas, or dog parks. Therefore, a good discussion was recommended with staff when the presentation is made; he said it conveys accurate priorities, not to discount dog owners, but the master plan provides the bigger picture.

Ms. Turner stated in her six years of service maybe four constituents strongly expressed a need for a dog park. She observed dog owners walking about neighborhoods, and many in her district favor the Murray Canal Trail, where dogs are leashed and well behaved.

Mr. Martinez observed dogs are often off leashes along the Murray Parkway Trail. She agreed communicating with Taylorsville would be worthwhile.

Mr. Cox said the Council should consider the master plan first and foremost; he and Ms. Lopez would contact Taylorsville City to check on possible opportunities. Ms. Dominguez thought working with Taylorsville was a good short-term solution, but thought Murray should have its own dog park. She noted a future dog park was third on priority list of the master plan, but was unsure where that was in line with the future. Mr. Cox would get back to the Council.



- **Council Compensation** - Diane Turner

Ms. Turner confirmed after a lack of Council support for a few years, she would again try to achieve pay increases for Council Members; if not supported, she would discontinue pushing it forward. She is personally fine with the current amount, however, she hoped the increase would encourage others to run for office, by making it more affordable, especially for diverse individuals, and young mothers with babysitting issues. She noted Mayor Camp and City staff are paid well, so it seemed the Council should have a base annual pay of \$20,000 instead of making 50 cents per hour; she said salary is a way of telling people they are valued. She agreed it would be hard to consider, because during a public meeting, Council Members would vote to approve their own pay increase. She addressed compensation in addition to the annual \$14,000 was received for expenses; however, a pay raise had not occurred in over 30 years. Ms. Turner requested input from the Council.

A handout was provided, to compare the Murray Council salary to other surrounding city councils. Ms. Martinez considered carefully salary comparisons. She explained as the bread winner she analyzed the Murray salary long-term, in addition to her full-time job pay, prior to running for office; this was important in her decision making. She said looking at the pay scale from an outside citizen perspective she agreed it appears significantly lower, and contemplated at that time whether she could afford to run. However, she was unaware of the monthly allowance, and cell phone reimbursements.

Mr. Cox agreed is difficult for single mothers with full time jobs to run for office, which is a nationwide challenge that needs fixing.

Mr. Hales said looking at the salary was one thing, however, when allowance and phone reimbursements are added, he thought the Council was paid well.

Ms. Martinez calculated the annual allowance of \$4,980 per year, and the base salary together, and stated it now allows her to consider changing her current full-time job, to part-time, because the pay is satisfactory. She expressed strong feelings about receiving a living wage, because it is often women who are responsible for childcare. She said it is important for those already struggling financially, and working second jobs to have the same opportunity as others when considering a council position. Ms. Martinez said she is more concerned with how their compensation appeared, than with how much it actually is, which was very unclear until in office, when it was explained.

Ms. Dominguez agreed the city council position is one that should be available to everyone.

Ms. Turner reiterated the increase was for future candidates to convey that Murray values the City Council, it would hearten others to realize running for office was financially possible, and not just affordable for older retired people. A lengthy conversation followed:

Ms. Dominguez favored the increase and providing a living wage. She said prior to her decision to run for council, she only considered how and when compensation occurred- she was not thinking about a pay increase; she did not go into office thinking there would be a pay increase: and there was never a conversation about the subject. She said the median age of a council member is over 50, which does

not reflect the Murray community as a whole. Now that she has been in office, she agreed an increase was thoughtful to those working two or three jobs, and for single mothers. She agreed the opportunity is more doable for retired persons with more time and opportunity. She stated she was not in office when an increase to Mayor Camp's salary occurred. She totaled City Council wages, which did not equal his annual salary, and thought since the Council shares equal but separate power, the increase was something she would definitely consider responsibly.

Ms. Martinez said as a resident she would like to see the allowance as part of their salary, for better transparency.

Mr. Hales counts his allowance as part of his salary, and clarified, allowance is reimbursement, whether for auto, gas, travel, and cell phones, and is not taxable. Therefore, it should remain that way, as it is for other City staff who receive monthly allowance.

Ms. Dominguez confirmed other city council members do not get monthly allowances, and rarely get cell phone reimbursements.

Mr. Cox said the City Council position could not be compared to Mayor Camp's full time job. He said the Mayor is not retired and works 40 hours per week, therefore, he said the decision for him to approve the Mayor's pay was justified. He agreed the Council position requires many necessary meetings, unexpected conversations and discussions; and time consuming responsibilities. He commented the City Council position requires dedicated service, which is why he ran for office. His desire was to act as public servant, not something he chose because of the pay. He said the Council has not had an increase in over 30 years, but the Council received the same 2.7% COLA (cost of living adjustment) increase last year and each COLA yearly just like all city employees. He acknowledged all Council Members came into the job voluntarily knowing it required time.

Ms. Turner thought the position required more time than she ever expected, with ongoing responsibility. All Council Members agreed it was time consuming on many levels.

Mr. Cox noted the size of Murray City compared with other cities; he said their compensation was equal, or above others. Ms. Turner agreed the same responsibilities apply regardless.

Ms. Martinez agreed when all compensation was totaled their pay was significantly comparable, if not higher than other cities. However, Murray has its own entities that require additional responsibilities, and other cities rely on the county for those services.

Mr. Cox agreed the Council relies on excellent department heads to educate them about various situations, concerns, and matters, so that good decisions are made. He said the City is not an organization like Kroger where price increases can make up for unexpected costs; city revenue comes from the wallets of citizens, property tax revenue, and other fees. He stated he ran for office because he wanted to, and he was not aware of the pay until he received his first paycheck. He discussed situations in other cities, where elected officials gave themselves pay raises, which did not go well. He said the Council is a great group of people, combined with intelligent department heads so he was personally happy with the existing pay rates. He said it would be hard at a time like this to go to citizens and convince the public that the City Council is underpaid. Ms. Turner disagreed.

Ms. Martinez said the majority of the public conceives the Council only meets twice a month, however, it is much more than that. She said in the beginning she believed anything less than \$20,000 was not equivalent to the amount of work required, in that someone could have a part time job and do council work part time also. But with the allowance a person could manage all responsibilities of a part time job, and perform well as a council member. She agreed with Ms. Turner the council position should be available for qualified passionate people, regardless of their economic status. She said she relates well with those in her district at the same economic level, as a renter, with various similar financial challenges, so she believes she will represent her district well, due to those commonalities; she hesitated to support the increase.

Ms. Turner said the current salary was not problematic for her, she was concerned about persons wanting to run for council in the future.

Ms. Dominguez wondered what the equivalent pay would be - at an hourly rate. Ms. Turner said there was no way to quantify those hours, due to the enormity of responsibilities. She said the position permeates her entire life, where constituents approach her continually. Therefore, she could not accurately calculate weekly work hours because she is working constantly.

Ms. Dominguez said prior to her election she was not aware of the many responsibilities. All Council Members agreed. She said not all Council members have equal available time, due to outside obligations. They all serve in different capacities throughout the duration of their term; therefore, those differences should be valued. She noted the opposite occurred in her past experiences, as a woman of color, so encouraging others to run was important to her.

Ms. Dominguez asked about past conversations related to approving Mayor Camp's salary increase. Ms. Turner said there was never an open conversation about it. Ms. Lopez explained the salary for the mayor position was increased one time, at the suggestion of former Mayor Eyre, for the very reason Ms. Turner wanted to increase the Council wage; for future individuals. Then Mayor Camp's increase occurred to compensate State retirement he would have received had he not been elected. Mr. Hales confirmed Mayor Camp came to the City Council initially when he was made aware of losing that income to become a full-time city employee as mayor.

Ms. Turner applied the equation Salt Lake County utilized, for seven council members' salaries equal to the total salary of the Salt Lake County Mayor. Therefore, she requested that same fairness for Murray City Council Members; a base salary of \$20,000 along with the monthly allowances.

Ms. Martinez thought the equation was important because both branches of government work together. Ms. Lopez noted Salt Lake City used a different equation, which was each council member receiving 25% of the mayor's pay. It was noted that Salt Lake County council members earn approximately \$36,000 annually, however, no allowance is offered. Ms. Turner noted each Salt Lake County council member has a full-time staff member to assist them. Mr. Cox stated Salt Lake County has a much large tax base, which is a much different situation. Ms. Dominguez said the Murray Council salary did not have to be that much. Ms. Turner clarified her suggested increase would provide a base pay of \$20,000.

Mr. Hales reiterated his opposition and encouraged other Council Members to give a final opinion so that Ms. Turner could determine what support she may have.

Ms. Dominguez briefly discussed assumptions made by the public that elected officials receive compensation on the back end during the campaign process, which makes them beholden to donors, to sway voting; this was not her experience. She favored the increase and agreed more transparency was needed to reflect what compensation is provided.

In conclusion, Mr. Cox said he did accept campaign money but made it clear that there were no strings attached, so if donors disagree with his voting decisions, he is not obligated to anyone. He agreed people run for different reasons, but financial income was not one of his reasons. He noted other cities not offering allowance, and if a property tax increase was necessary in the future, he questioned two new council members voting to approve pay raises so early into their term; he did not support the increase.

Ms. Martinez supported the possibility of approving a pay increase now – but implemented in the future. Ms. Turner confirmed the increase would affect the current council; she reiterated she is fine with the amount herself and if not supported she would not address the issue again. Ms. Lopez stated a sitting council cannot make decisions for a future council. Ms. Dominguez asked if the initiative could be tabled for a later time. Ms. Turner hesitated to delay the discussion again.

Ms. Martinez concluded after studying city comparisons, calculating all compensation with allowances, the total was fine; she was happy with it, and did not favor the pay increase.

**Adjournment:** 3:40 p.m.

**Pattie Johnson  
Council Office Administrator II**

ATTACHMENT #1

# MURRAY CITY SOCIAL MEDIA POLICY

Murray City recognizes that social media has changed the way that people communicate with each other and that the use of social media can enhance communication between City government and citizens, particularly citizens that do not access traditional media. The City encourages the use of social media to further the mission of the City and its departments where appropriate.

## POLICY

Murray City departments may utilize social media and social network sites to enhance communications with citizens and program participants subject to the following rules and guidelines:

1. All Murray City social media sites shall be approved by the Mayor or designee. The Director of each department or the Director's designee shall be responsible for the content, upkeep and closure of each social media site maintained by that department.
2. Murray City social media sites shall generally be used for (1) marketing/promotional channels which increase the City's ability to broadcast its messages to the widest possible audience, (2) public information updates, and (3) the dissemination of time-sensitive information as quickly as possible (example: emergency information).
3. Content posted to Murray City social media sites shall also be made available on the City's main website. Content posted to City social media sites should contain links directing users back to the City's official website for in-depth information, forms, documents or online services necessary to conduct business with the City.
4. Use of City and department logos must conform to design guidelines.
5. Authorized employees representing the City via social media outlets must conduct themselves always as a representative of the City and in accordance with all appropriate Murray City policies and standards, including but not limited to the Employee Handbook. Employees found in violation of this policy may be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment.
6. Employees should get written permission before posting images of individuals. Additionally, employees should get written permission to use a third party's copyrights, copyrighted material, trademarks, service marks or other intellectual property.
7. City social media sites shall be used only for communication of City related information in accordance with the City's mission and shall not be used for personal purposes.
8. City social media sites shall comply with federal, state and local laws, regulations and administrative rules.
9. City social media sites are subject to State of Utah public records laws (GRAMA). The department maintaining the site is responsible to maintain and provide, upon request, any public records on social media sites. Content related to City business shall be

maintained in an accessible format and so that it can be produced in response to a request. Wherever possible, such sites shall clearly indicate that any articles and any other content posted or submitted for posting are subject to public disclosure. Utah state law and relevant Murray City records retention schedules apply to social media formats and social media content. The department maintaining a site shall preserve records required to be maintained pursuant to a relevant records retention schedule for the required retention period. Appropriate retention formats for specific social media tools shall be determined by the City Recorder's Office.

10. Users and visitors to social media sites shall be notified that the intended purpose of the site is to serve as a mechanism for communication between City departments and members of the public. Murray City social media site articles and comments containing any of the following forms of content shall not be allowed: a. Comments in support of or opposition to political campaigns or ballot measures; b. Profane language or content; c. Content that promotes, fosters, or perpetuates discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, age, religion, gender, marital status, status with regard to public assistance, national origin, physical or mental disability or sexual orientation; d. Sexual content or links to sexual content; e. Solicitations of commerce; f. Conduct or encouragement of illegal activity; g. Information that may tend to compromise the safety or security of the public or public systems; h. Content that violates a legal ownership interest of any other party; or i. Comments not topically related to the particular social medium article being commented upon, including random or unintelligible comments; j. Hyperlinks to other sites unrelated to the topic.
11. Where possible, a disclaimer should be posted on social media sites that states, "Murray City is not responsible for messages posted by visitors to the site. The City does not monitor this social media site outside of normal business hours. If there is an emergency or if you need immediate help please call 801-840-4000."
12. City employees monitoring the social media site should report emergency or safety notifications on social media sites to the department director as soon as possible.
13. The guidelines described above should be displayed to users or made available by hyperlink. A copy of any content removed based on these guidelines must be retained, including the time, date and identity of the poster when available.
14. The City reserves the right to restrict or remove any content that is deemed to be in violation of this social media policy or any applicable law.
15. The social media tools that are currently approved for use by Murray City are Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and Pinterest. If any City department desires to use any other social media tool, such use must be approved by the Mayor or designee.
16. All content created or posted on a City social media site as well as all City profile and home pages shall belong to the City. All login and password information shall be retained by the Mayor, the Director of each department or designee, and the City's IT division director. Third party information, such as names, addresses, phone numbers, etc. are confidential and should not be distributed to non-City individuals or businesses.

**ATTACHMENT #2**



## **Fiscal Year 2020 – 2021 Budget Process and Dates**

**Tuesday, April 21, 2020** CM - Mayor's Budget Address

Consider a resolution to acknowledge receipt of the **Mayor's Tentative Budget**

Receive Budget binders for study

**Monday, May 11, 2020** Budget Review with Departments

Lunch for all participants at 12 noon. Meeting 12:30 – 5:00 p.m.

**Tuesday, May 12, 2020** Budget Review with Departments

Light lunch for Council Members only. Meeting 12:30 – 5:00 p.m.

**Friday, May 15, 2020** Budget Reconciliation Meeting 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. This meeting is for further discussion and budget adjustments that Council may deem necessary.

**Tuesday, May 19, 2020** CM - Consideration of adoption of the **Council's Tentative Budget and Setting the Public Hearing**

**Tuesday, June 2, 2020** CM - Budget Public Hearing

Public Hearing related to department transfers.

**Tuesday, June 16, 2020** CM - Adopt Final FY 2020-2021 Budgets

Adopt Tax Levies for the City and Library

**August 2020**

Truth in Taxation Hearing if the City Budget includes a property tax increase.

The exact date will be set by Salt Lake County.