



## MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Murray City Municipal Council met on Tuesday, August 25, 2020 for a meeting held electronically in accordance with the provisions of Utah Code 52-4-207(4), Open and Public Meeting Act, due to infectious disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus. Council Chair, Rosalba Dominguez, determined that to protect the health and welfare of Murray citizens, an in person City Council meeting, including attendance by the public and the City Council is not practical or prudent. She stated:

Considering the continued rise of COVID-19 case counts in Utah, meeting in an anchor location presents substantial risk to the health and safety of those in attendance because physical distancing measures may be difficult to maintain in the Murray City Council Chambers. The Center for Disease Control states that COVID-19 is easily spread from person to person between people who are in close contact with one another. The spread is through respiratory droplets when an infected person coughs, sneezes or talks and may be spread by people who are non-symptomatic. The intent is to safeguard the lives of Murray residents, business owners, employees and elected officials by meeting remotely through electronic means without an anchor location.

The public may view the meeting via the live stream at:  
[www.murraycitylive.com](http://www.murraycitylive.com) or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>

Citizen comments or public hearing comments may be submitted by sending an email in advance or during the meeting to [city.council@murray.utah.gov](mailto:city.council@murray.utah.gov). Comments are limited to less than three minutes, include your name and contact information, and they will be read into the record.

**Council Members in Attendance:**

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

**Others in Attendance:**

Blair Camp	Mayor	Janet Lopez	City Council Director
Brenda Moore	Finance Director	Jennifer Kennedy	City Recorder
Jennifer Heaps	Chief Communications Officer	Pattie Johnson	City Council Office Admin.
Craig Burnett	Police Chief	Danny Astill	Public Works Director
Melinda Greenwood	CED Director	Jared Hall	CED
G.L. Critchfield	City Attorney	Bill Francis	The Imagination Company
Jay Baughman	CED	Galina Urry	Salt Lake County
Alison Trease	NeighborWorks	Rashelle Hobbs	County Recorder
Rob Poirier	NeighborWorks		

Ms. Dominguez called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 4:15 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes** – Ms. Dominguez asked for comments or a motion on the minutes from Committee of the Whole meetings; June 2, 2020, and June 16, 2020. Mr. Hales moved approval on both sets of minutes. Ms. Martinez seconded the motion. (Approved 5-0)

**Discussion Items:**

**Salt Lake County Property Watch Program** –Salt Lake County Recorder, Ms. Hobbs gave a presentation to explain what the recorder’s office does. She read the Mission Statement, and said their office oversees transactions that have to do with real property by maintaining a data base of over 14 million documents. For the property record to be accurate and complete, staff must record, abstract, index and plat all documents. She reported this year so far over 190,000 documents have been recorded; and they anticipate having a record setting year in recordation. Ms. Hobbs commended her staff of 42 employees for hard work and keeping up well, to accomplish the tasks where they had 40% increase in documents in the first half of the year.

In 2019 they worked to ensure collaborative relationships, both with fellow recorders across the State to insure that best practices are implemented; customer service is outstanding, and that their new system going forward is intuitive and secure. Meeting one on one with many of the major title insurance companies has helped to see that their office is providing necessary services for constituents to carry out their business. Feedback from residents about changes to process was sought to maximize their efficiency.

Ms. Hobbs said community outreach and their service is very important to her; therefore, she and staff visited all 16 Salt Lake County senior centers, where they offered expertise, help, and complete copies of property records. Thousands of records were found, and hundreds of individuals were assisted as a result.

In recent months, staff has worked from home to find refuge from the virus. She noted that home ownership has remained the American dream. To protect property records, a new free service was launched called Property Watch, which is a service that notifies home owners when something is recorded on their title. She explained the great resource will prevent title fraud, while protecting property records, and offers peace of mind; there are currently over 7,700 subscribers. Murray City makes up for 440 participants, and their hope is to see that number increase. Anyone can access the Property Watch link on their website by providing email address and Salt Lake County home address. Ms. Hobbs shared feedback from participants which expressed how powerful useful, and appreciated the source is, which provides comforting security.

**Council Comments:**

- Ms. Turner asked how fraudulent activity can be removed from records. Ms. Hobbs advised people work with title companies, and seek an attorney. She noted bad records are not discovered until a home is in the middle of a sale, which brings surprisingly unwanted complications.
- Mr. Hales said it was a great idea; and noted his work experience at a credit union; faulty records were not realized until refinancing, or when a home was being sold. He confirmed a simple mistake can stop all sale transactions from moving forward. Ms. Hobbs stated the program empowers home owners by knowing how and when to resolve issues in a timely manner.
- Mr. Hales added anyone can place a lien on any property, which goes unseen if people are not aware.

Ms. Hobbs explained her staff only records information as it is received- they do not verify details about why information is getting placed on records in that process.

- Mr. Cox appreciated the great service as a personal subscriber; he highly suggested using it, and confirmed the program ensures the security of a home title. For example, an issue that occurred 20 years prior can be immediately realized by Property Watch. Ms. Hobbs agreed, and thanked Mr. Cox for conversations he had in the past with Senator Mayne to help promote the program. She said there are many unaffiliated third party vendors out there offering the service for a fee; but there is no charge with the county to attain the same public information. Anyone interested can find them on most social media; she suggested a link to Property Watch be placed on the City's website, and advertising in city newsletters to help get more Murray citizens enrolled.

**NeighborWorks Salt Lake Construction Project at 871 West Tripp Lane** – Ms. Trease, Manager of Murray NeighborWorks introduced Engineer, Rob Poirier who led the discussion.

Mr. Poirier explained as part of the process to design a ten-lot subdivision on Tripp Lane, the City requested that a road continue to connect Tripp Lane to Willow Grove Lane. The design was completed and presented to the Murray Planning Commission; however, one key issue to complete the plan, is to attain a key piece of property, currently located in a protection strip along the north side of the subdivision adjacent to the development. Mr. Poirier reported after speaking to all related departments in the City, that weighed in about why they all wanted to see the road connection, the main reason was noted as the health, and safety and welfare of the community as a whole. It was understood that it would be slight inconvenience for a few residents, but for the neighboring community, and how the road would function with traffic around the school was a benefit. He reported every department in the City, including fire and police, planning, public works, and utilities, all believe it is a greater benefit to have the road go through.

Mr. Poirier continued with numerous positive reasons and noted currently, in order for kids to get to the school, students must cross over private property and traverse through a ballfield. He explained the proposal provided children with a public sidewalk, streetlights and a safe passage. He believed the project would benefit the community, overall; however, to provide such passage, there is a need to take private property from the owner, which is not taken lightly. He noted the piece of property at the end of a dead-end street is not providing any use or enjoyment to the landowner; where the initial intent for Willow Grove Lane was always that it would go through connecting to Tripp Lane. In addition, the dead-end street on Willow Grove Lane does not provide a turnaround area for cars, required in Murray City design standards; so, the current situation would not be approved today.

He discussed public comments heard at the planning commission meeting; one homeowner on Willow Grove stated they never needed safety vehicles or emergency trucks on the dead-end street, so it was not important for the road go through. However, a member of the planning commission, who is a baseball coach of a baseball team shared in rebuttal an emergency instance that occurred at the ballfield, when the emergency vehicle could not get within hundreds of yards of the site, to reach the injured player; responders had to walk to the field, causing a significant delay.

Mr. Poirier said this incident provided a good example of why the through road should be approved for this community. He noted a similar story about emergency vehicles trying to get to the school, but were held up, due to traffic parked everywhere during ball season. He believed the road going through would alleviate many challenges, by providing another route for responders to gain entrance to the site; and said even though it might be inconvenient for a few folks to hear and see more cars, it benefits the City as

whole, to have better connectivity in and around the school. He noted one City planner performed a computation analysis study on the area, which determines how well roads connect to others; the result showed that the area is 'deficient.' He reiterated the road would help alleviate the connectivity challenge in that area, benefiting all. A lengthy conversation followed:

Council Comments and Discussion:

- Mr. Cox appreciated the information; however, he expressed more fear of having the road go through- than not. He said the housing and road development would offer hundreds of more cars on the road; traveling it two or three times per day, creating more congestion to the small neighborhood, with already small roads. He felt putting the road in would not help with health and safety issues for ambulance and fire trucks; and though he appreciated the presentation he affirmed there has never been sufficient parking for ball players, or for those that attend. He said the road would put more traffic in the area, with cars parking on both sides of the new road. He guaranteed the road would only add more parking spots for the ballfield. Therefore, he did not favor the road continuation, which would decimate the neighborhood that already has small bottleneck roads.
- Mr. Cox continued stating morning and afternoon school traffic would increase, and children walking the new road would be endangered by a higher volume of traffic. He felt police cars getting through would not be problematic, but large fire apparatus and swift ambulances would. He stressed that anyone who visits the area during normal times, would agree that maneuvering through that area was a challenge already, let alone during ball season; a new road would not alleviate those problems. He discussed traffic along 700 West, which during school drop off and pick up hours backs up to 5300 South, and Winchester; therefore, when people know about the new through street, there will be a significant increase of traffic in that neighborhood. He reiterated that fire apparatus getting through the small road would be the bigger problem and the only way to fix that is to close the road to Tripp Lane and not allow people to park on either side of it. He thought a cul-de-sac or dead-end road would be better options; and concluded opening the road would not fix any of the existing problems in the area.
- Ms. Dominguez requested the aerial photo be displayed to better analyze. Ms. Trease shared engineering drawings and the aerial photo; she pointed out a small area of private property on which students cross leading to the ball field parking lot, leading to the school.
- Mr. Poirier argued lighting and public sidewalks would give kids a better route; noting during ball season the parking lot they enter is very busy; off season they walk past empty structures poised for mischief. He restated the clear intent was for the road to go through, and it is seldom seen in subdivision designs that pedestrians cross through private properties for sidewalks, which is not a preferred route. He pointed out that every other road in the area, was a *cul-de-sac*, and this street did not because the original designer planned for the road to go through to Tripp Lane. He believed any fire marshal would speak against a dead-end road of 250 feet; and disagreed with Mr. Cox stating two roads to a ball field was more ideal than one road. He thought opening the new road gave more opportunity for emergency vehicles and for citizens to leave the area, preventing congestion on Riverside.
- Mr. Poirier explained a general planning and transportation principal that the more traffic is evenly dispersed through a city, the safer that city is. When traffic is concentrated to a certain area, it creates the problem of turning around, and traffic accidents. The idea is to use all streets more evenly, rather than concentrated at certain locations. He emphasized the importance for connectivity for emergency vehicles; and shared more views from a public works utilities standpoint, regarding easements and maintenance of the system, as follows:
  - If the road does not go through sewer and water mains for the new subdivision would have to

run through people's side-yards, which is not allowed in other surrounding cities.

- Because new water, sewer, and storm drains would be needed, easements would have to be as wide as the pavement on Willow Grove Lane. Generally, over time, it is typical that planted trees, decks, and sheds are placed over these areas and become obstructions. Therefore, it is easier to work on repairs in a road, as opposed to removing and clearing barriers located in people's yards when emergency problems arise.
- With a cul-de-sac, due to excessive storms, it is for the same reason they prefer not to have storm drains located in people's side-yards; all overflow water would run off into people's side-yards. However, with a through road for the subdivision there would be a detention pond, so, if the pond overflows, water would run into the public right-of-way, and down the street.
- Mr. Cox appreciated Mr. Poirier speaking for fire marshals and others and observed all related department opinions have specific goals in mind for development of the area; however, his main concern was for the safety of families affected on nearby streets. In looking at the proposed street size on the map, he felt it would be narrow and clogged because existing parking for the ballfield was already small in size; and as a result, the proposed new street would become a parking lot itself during ball season. He believed the street would be too narrow for car flow with cars parking on each side. He agreed there would be connectively but not better access for large fire apparatus with parked cars along the road.
- Mr. Cox pointed out the ballpark has four separate ball fields, with only enough parking spaces for about twenty cars: he was sure visitors and ball players would be parking along the proposed road, and down throughout the neighborhood, which he saw as problematic. He clarified, if the proposed road was wider, he would not be as opposed. He already witnessed how ball games decimate the existing neighborhood roads, and how traffic shuts down the neighborhood for two and half hours per day, in the comings and goings between ball games. He reiterated the result of a narrow road would only spread problem parking further into the neighborhood. As far as utilities, he learned in discussions as well, to understand that utility lines can run through the existing road, and the private property owner would also allow them to run through the right-of-way. He noted the existing sidewalks for pedestrians, and students; and non-existent car activity in the ballfield parking lot when kids walk to and from school- because games are held on late afternoons, and weekends.
- Mr. Cox said the debate was valid, but facts remain that opening the road would create more traffic, more congestion and more danger to children walking to and from school, as opposed to walking through an empty ball field. And he felt certain there would be significant traffic jams every morning and afternoon with parents driving kids to school, which is where children would be walking.
- Despite that debate, Mr. Cox stood firm on reasons for opposing construction of a through road. He admitted safety concerns exist with both scenarios but felt stronger that the road was not a good resolution for fire trucks getting better access to the neighborhood, especially during ball season. He observed, as things are now, fire trucks can access the area just fine during the off season.
- Mr. Hall agreed both arguments were valid, which were heard at the public hearing. He noted the road connection was not a perfect solution; however, the original intent was to have the road go through. He thought connecting streets together increased overall circulation, which was beneficial to the housing project.
- Mr. Cox clarified he was not against the great project, which he favored. He was against the design of the road; he felt it was easy for anyone to say connectivity was beneficial, except by those directly impacted and living on streets with increased traffic. He perceived the initial plan was designed many years ago- when the neighboring population was much lower; houses were fewer, and traffic volume and overall congestion was much less. He concluded things have changed a lot since the original design was implemented. He thought dead ending the street would be best, where utilities

could still be installed in a cul-de-sac road.

- Mr. Critchfield announced the purpose of the meeting discussion was to start the process to fulfill a condition the planning commission made when they approved the preliminary subdivision. The condition being that the applicant obtain the piece of private property; he said this should be the focus of the discussion. He explained if the applicant was unable to purchase the parcel, the next step option is to approach the Council City in the future, to consider eminent domain on their behalf. He noted in review of the process, so far, the applicant cannot obtain the parcel. As a result, to alert the council about the situation, a resolution implementing eminent domain would be presented for their consideration to help resolve the matter. He affirmed if the council votes in favor of eminent domain, the process continues for another 90 days before that decision is made. He clarified the current discussion was not primarily about development, but whether there was an appetite going forward to approve eminent domain during a future council meeting.
- Mr. Hales indicated the subject property was a narrow strip. Mr. Poirier confirmed it was remnant parcel wrongfully surveyed; acquired by the original homeowner. That owner purchased the land, which is a very small piece at the end of the dead-end street.
- Ms. Dominguez determined the small piece of property was not part of the homeowner's daily activity. Mr. Poirier agreed giving up the parcel would not hurt the enjoyment of the landowner's personal property, where 3 feet of landscaped area would remain. The piece of private property is what kids utilize, which creates a liability concern.
- Ms. Turner commented that the area was not in her district; she was aware of the situation; but did not know well the circumstances. She reported receiving six emails from citizens requesting the street go through; they cited public health concerns as the reason, and she wanted to learn more about how neighboring residents feel having a through road; she asked if a better walking path through the parcel would ensure safety.
- Ms. Dominguez asked if a cul-de-sac would block the existing walkway; and who was liable for accidents on the parcel. Mr. Poirier replied no- students would still have access to the ball field leading to the school. He noted liability falls on the property owner. Ms. Dominguez asked if the property owner could close off the access path. Mr. Poirier confirmed if that happened students would be forced to find another way to school.
- Ms. Martinez said eminent domain should not be taken lightly; even though a seemingly small piece of private property looked unused. She reported hearing both sides of the argument; some residents favoring the road, and others not wanting increased traffic. She expressed frustration, and thought it was an unfortunate case of huge mismanagement of a parcel- in the past, which needed to be cleaned up. She said although many have their opinion, it was not possible to speak on behalf of new future homeowners, as to whether a through street or a cul-de-sac, was best for them.
- Mr. Cox affirmed the ball field property belongs to the school district, and even though the parking lot is not striped, it sits empty most of the year and is an open way that leads safely to sidewalks at the school. He confirmed the Council heard all public comments at the last council meeting.
- Ms. Dominguez recalled citizen comments also; watched the planning commission meeting; and noted opposing opinions on both sides. She asked Ms. Trease if NeighborWorks communicated with the school district about the situation. Ms. Trease reached out to the school principal but as expected with the startup of school- she had not heard back. Ms. Trease spoke to the homeowner to discuss NeighborWorks desire to purchase the parcel and explained the possibility of eminent domain; she reported landowners were not interested in money or looking to sell because they do not want a through road constructed. Ms. Trease agreed there were arguments on both sides.
- Ms. Dominguez thought there was much to consider and noted eminent domain as a long process where the landowner could face costly legal fees if a settlement was not accepted. She commended

the planning commission for practicing due diligence and suggested an ordinance might help the community by restricting parking to neighboring residents only. She thought although a traffic study was not allowed in the area, traffic patterns could be analyzed to determine the impact for creating better traffic flow. She asked how home lot costs would change, whether constructed on a through street, or on a cul-de-sac. Mr. Poirier stated lot sizes would not change, but buildable pad sizes would, due to odd shapes required to create a cul-de-sac. House sizes would be significantly smaller, with a reduced size area for utility easements. He thought small to medium size homes would result, and home costs would be about the same. Ms. Trease noted if development plans change to include a cul-de-sac, increased expenses would be seen in redesigning the plan that would slightly increase home costs. Mr. Poirier noted the current configuration was designed for homes to have 2-3 stall garages, which would not be possible if the plan changed to a cul-de-sac. He said the Murray planning commission officials are well educated and did a great job with the plan; after going through a long process; he advised the Council to watch the meeting to get a better understanding of why they and City staff favored the road going through.

- Ms. Dominguez requested Council feedback to determine whether the item should return to the Council for further study regarding a cul-de-sac; or, should the item endure the lengthy process of eminent domain during a council meeting; an opinion poll was called as follows:
  - Mr. Hales was apprehensive about giving his opinion at this time, and was undecided, due to possible changes and information he may consider later. He thought it was best to let the item run through the normal process.
  - Mr. Cox reaffirmed opposition to having the road go through.
  - Ms. Turner expressed a desire to learn more about the situation, to gain a better sense of impact to the area. She reiterated concerns about public safety and favored doing what was best for the larger amount of people affected, rather than a very few. She asked that the issue be moved forward to a council meeting.
  - Ms. Martinez leaned towards a cul-de-sac; and not eminent domain. She said if the majority of the Council was ready to process the issue during a council meeting, she was not opposed.
  - Ms. Dominguez agreed and encouraged Ms. Trease and Mr. Poirier to return to a council meeting with more information. She confirmed the Council received an informative packet from the planning commission; however, she thought communication with the school district could be better managed. She advised residents to contact the school district as well, to discuss safety concerns; and invited the public to attend the upcoming council meeting in October 2020, to share additional comments.

**FY (Fiscal Year) 2020-2021 Budget Amendment** – Ms. Moore informed the Council that they would be considering the FY 2020-2021 budget amendment during the next council meeting on September 1, 2020. The annual roll forward of projects and specific items from the FY 2020 budget, to the FY 2021 budget was presented, along with two new grant receipts. (See Attachment #1)

Multiple line items were noted in the amendment; Ms. Moore explained the process was to roll money forward to finish projects not completed in 2020. She noted some projects and amounts in the memo would change between now and the September council meeting, due to invoices not yet received for services rendered in FY 2020. A copy of the ordinance was included in the public meeting request. Since the list was lengthy, Ms. Moore highlighted the following roll forward items, as well as, new money items:

- **Grants Received/Rolled:**
  - Receive and appropriate a \$15,000 - Utah Humanities CARES grant, to reinstate a part-time

- employee laid off, due to COVID-19.
- Receive and appropriate \$4,000 - Utah Division of Arts and Museums CARES grant.
- Roll \$101,783 - Justice Department COVID grant not spent.
- Roll \$1,681 - Victim Advocates - Beard donation money not spent.
- **Revenue/Expense Neutral:**
  - General Fund: Increase animal control contract services \$12,928 from *non-departmental miscellaneous* expense - for Urban Wildlife Assistance Program.
  - CIP: Receive \$200,000 - Transfer revenue from the RDA and appropriate it to build the 4250 South road extension.
  - Water Fund: Decrease water bond proceeds and capital projects infrastructure = \$5,600,000; funds were received last year.
- **New Money from Reserves:**
  - Appropriate insurance increases. Due to open enrollment and the addition of new family enrollments, various department budgets will increase for General Fund = \$42,501.
  - In the CIP: Appropriate \$105,029 to purchase the Verizon cell tower property from the RDA, with reserves.
- **Roll Forward Projects from FY20 to FY21:**
  - **Enterprise Funds:** Central Garage = \$8,534. Additional money needed for roof mounted swamp cooler.
  - **Capital Improvement Projects Fund:**
    - Purchase clean energy vehicles = \$27,944
    - Police car replaced by insurance = \$42,925
    - Police equipment replacement plan = \$46,703
    - Parks: Pavilion replacement project = \$300,000. (New money) Additional funding is needed to include the construction of new public restrooms at Pavilion #5
    - Murray Theater - Ms. Moore led a discussion about the Murray Theater, stating \$500,000 appropriated in FY 2021 for renovations will be removed from the CIP budget. Her plan is to reverse the budget and let the previous year's budget increase in reserves. She explained Salt Lake County pulled TRCC (Tourism, Recreation, Culture and Convention) funds from the project, due to COVID-19; so, approximately \$456,888 of the FY 2020 budget is not being rolled forward. Ms. Moore thought it would be two or more years, if ever, before the County could provide their half of the matching funds, due to the ongoing crisis. With such uncertainty she did not know where the project was headed so, her hope was to apply \$300,000 of the FY 2020 Murray Theater budget to new restrooms at pavilion #5. Ms. Moore acknowledged some Council Members preferred that money remain in the account. Before finalizing the budget document changes, she asked the Council for quick feedback, as to whether the money should remain in savings for the theater, with hopes of generating the lacking funds at a later time; or, should the money be returned to reserves.

**Council Comments and Discussion:**

- Ms. Turner noted meeting with Ms. Moore prior to Committee of the Whole to review the budget amendment line by line. She expressed concern with moving the funding for the Murray Theater out of CIP savings because she thought it was an important project for the community. It was her opinion to keep the money secure; saving it for renovations later, with hopes of Ms. Moore finding the funds from another account to pay for restrooms at pavilion #5.
- Mr. Cox was fine with leaving the money in savings, as long as this did not hurt or delay other



projects the City needs. He had confidence in Ms. Moore to find \$300,000 elsewhere for new restrooms, in order to leave theater savings in place. He favored remodeling the theater but agreed, due to the current crisis, it would be a long time before any movement would be seen at the site; and stressed that he did not want other projects to suffer while money sits.

- Ms. Dominguez asked how much money was available in the Parks CIP account; she noted it was additional funding requested to provide restrooms at pavilion #5. Ms. Moore reported \$1.2 million was left, and if restrooms are added another \$300,000 was needed. She confirmed unused funds were available in the CIP that could be utilized instead- but pointed out money left in a savings program for the theater would not be earning interest.
- Ms. Dominguez hated to lose the theater and inquired if money was moved out from savings would the City be able to address repairs while the facility sat vacant; for instance, a leaky roof or broken windows. Ms. Moore noted the *facilities division* currently oversees the building, where expenses for utilities and heating are covered under that budget. Staff would continue to monitor the condition of the building to prevent further deterioration. If repairs are needed those expenses would be addressed by utilizing existing savings- if left in the account- or by *maintenance* costs through the CIP.
- Ms. Dominguez said assuming \$500,000 remained in CIP reserves, what would become of the theater over time. Ms. Moore confirmed until full funding was possible, City staff would continue to maintain the building; she stressed there was no way the City can pay for the entire renovation project on its own. Ms. Dominguez concluded County funding could possibly be reinstated at a later date; and preferred the savings remain set aside for the project.
- Ms. Martinez appreciated Ms. Moore locating other money to provide for pavilion restrooms; she stressed that was very important to the public. She supported keeping the savings allocated to the Murray Theater account.
- Mr. Hales favored keeping money in place for theater renovations; and felt once funds are moved out, it would be a challenge to get them back again. He understood if funds were needed elsewhere for current projects, access to that money was an option. He voiced support for additional \$300,000 necessary for restrooms at pavilion #5. Off topic, he wondered about the increase in insurance enrollments from individual plans, to family plans; and asked what the cost difference was. Ms. Moore said it was about a \$10,000 increase per family plan.
- Ms. Moore would create new documents to reflect the Council's wishes regarding the theater project and return for the council meeting.

**Metro Narcotics Task Force Agreement** – Chief Burnett explained it was time to update and sign the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) agreement, which is updated each year. He said the Murray Police Department participated in the Metro Narcotics Task Force for about 20 years. This year there were minor changes: a staff change, a new subsection added to Title #12, Task Force Disbandment; and Forfeited Asset Sharing, regarding federal government funding distribution changes where participants receive a percentage of shared money. In addition, new agencies joined the task force; Summit County, and Tooele City. Chief Burnett noted the City has one officer assigned to the task force. The Council would consider approving the agreement at the next council meeting.

**Council Comments and Discussion:**

- Ms. Turner commented that this type of coordination was so important; and expressed appreciation that the Chief was continuing with participation. Chief Burnett agreed it was immensely helpful to his police force by giving them the good resources from the federal government. He reported this

year the Murray officer involved was in the middle of a significant case and was currently the lead task force agent.

- Ms. Dominguez asked how frequent new officers are cycled in and out of the program. Chief Burnett said, due to the nature of the work and lengthy cases; it is a three-year rotation. Regular detective rotations are five years. Ms. Dominguez asked how many officers have completed the program. The Chief replied in his 35-year career there was always a program of this nature where officers participated for three years at a time; he said this equated to many officers over years of time that have gained great expertise in the management of solving major cases. He concluded the program is highly sought after by all officers.

**Announcements:** Ms. Lopez noted upcoming registration for ULCT (Utah League of Cities and Towns) 2020 Annual Convention, to be held electronically this year on September 21-25 for those interested.

**Adjournment:** 5:49 p.m.

**Pattie Johnson**  
**Council Office Administrator II**

## ATTACHMENT #1



---

TO: Murray City Municipal Council

From: Brenda Moore, Finance & Administration Director

Date: August 11, 2020

Re: Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Opening

A budget opening has been requested for September 1. The opening will request funds and budget adjustments for the following purposes:

- Projects in-progress at FY 2020 Year-end (CIP annual roll-forward)
- Receive and allocate several grant awards
- Reconcile changes in wages and benefits due to health insurance open enrollment changes
- Move budget between departments for the Urban Wildlife Assistance program
- Adjust the water fund budget for bond proceeds received in FY2020
- Remove the FY2021 Murray Theater renovation budget from the capital improvement projects fund

**Grants Received/Rolled**

1. Roll \$2,118 Jimmy Johns sponsorship money not spent by the Park Center for recreation programs
2. Roll \$1,681 beard donation money not spent by the victim advocates
3. Roll \$112,282 Justice Department COVID-19 grant not spent
4. Receive and appropriate a \$15,000 Utah Humanities CARES grant
5. Receive and appropriate a \$4,000 Utah Division of Arts & Museums CARES grant

**Revenue-Expense Neutral**

6. Receive and appropriate \$2,074,149 from Salt Lake County for Vine Street, 900 East to Van Winkle project (\$456,341) and the Hanauer Street extension (\$1,617,808)
7. In the general fund, increase the animal control contract services \$12,928 for the Urban Wildlife Assistance Program from non-departmental miscellaneous expense
8. In the capital projects fund, receive \$200,000 transfer revenue from the RDA and appropriate \$200,000 to build the 4250 South road extension
9. In the water fund, decrease water bond proceeds and capital projects infrastructure \$5,600,000. The remaining state water bonds were issued in FY2020. The FY2020 budget was amended June 27 in Ordinance 20-21

**From Reserves**

10. Appropriate insurance increases due to open enrollment from reserves: general fund total \$42,501. (Police Department \$9,901, Fire Department \$6,979, Streets Division \$7,160, and IT Department \$18,461). Water fund total is \$15,573
11. In the capital projects fund, appropriate \$105,029 for the purchase of the Verizon Cell tower property from reserves

## **Rollover Projects from FY20 to FY21**

### **General Fund Class C**

- 12. 4800 South overlay from heavy rail tracks west to city limit \$340,514
- 13. Various sealer projects \$159,627
- 14. Various street maintenance projects \$129,786
- 15. Sidewalk repair projects \$34,096

### **Enterprise Funds**

- 16. Munis utility billing implementation, solid waste fund \$23,517, and storm water fund \$32,037
- 17. Water fund – State Street water line replacement, Murray Park and 4500 South well projects remaining bond proceeds \$2,695,494
- 18. Wastewater fund
  - a. Service truck not received until July \$40,000
  - b. Various sewer rebuilds and maintenance projects including Central Valley Water plant rebuild \$1,967,850
- 19. Central Garage – roof mounted swamp cooler \$4,586
- 20. Central Garage – additional amount needed for roof mounted swamp cooler \$8,534
- 21. Power
  - a. Street trees \$25,250 (tree planting postponed from spring to fall due to COVID-19)
  - b. Building improvements \$100,000
  - c. Downtown undergrounding project \$98,108
  - d. Vehicle and equipment replacement plan \$212,438

### **Capital Improvement Projects Fund**

- 22. Clean energy vehicle/equipment \$27,994
- 23. Court equipment replacement plan \$19,110
- 24. Police car replaced by insurance \$42,925
- 25. Police equipment replacement plan \$46,703
- 26. Fire equipment replacement plan \$530,386
- 27. Fire station 81 project \$320,412
- 28. Parks
  - a. Parks equipment replacement program \$22,527
  - b. Park Center equipment replacement plan \$2,251
  - c. Recreation equipment replacement plan
    - i. Breakaway basketball hoops at the Park Center \$5,000
    - ii. Install adjustable hoops north side Park Center \$8,000
    - iii. Replace scoreboard at Christ Lutheran Church \$6,000 (used for recreation programs)
  - d. Senior Recreation Center equipment replacement plan \$13,000
  - e. Cemetery irrigation booster pump \$15,000
  - f. Cemetery equipment replacement plan \$13,676
  - g. Parks pavilion replacement project \$1,359,671
  - h. Parks pavilion replacement project additional amount to build new restrooms \$300,000 (reprogramming a portion of the Murray Theater renovation budget)
  - i. Facilities – various projects as needed \$695,412

29. Community Development
  - a. Downtown environmental \$115,600
  - b. Vehicle/equipment replacement plan \$20,730
  - c. Building abatement \$39,435
30. Non-departmental city hall equipment replacement plan \$30,000
31. Information Technology
  - a. Police printers \$4,825
  - b. Sophos Antivirus \$16,000
  - c. Spillman server migration \$35,000
  - d. IVR (interactive voice response system) \$23,400
  - e. Equipment replacement plan \$117,250
  - f. Document management system \$95,081
  - g. GIS equipment replacement plan \$17,117
32. Engineering transportation master plan \$70,175
33. City Hall project \$386,279
34. Streets equipment replacement plan \$89,742
35. Streets Projects
  - a. 5600 South State to Van Winkle \$162,856
  - b. Joma, Westridge and 6410 South \$220,000
  - c. 320 East 6230 South \$201,961
  - d. Cottonwood/Winchester to city boundary \$130,000
  - e. Hanauer Street design, site work \$96,000
36. Murray Theater - Due to the county pulling the TRCC funds from the Murray Theater renovation project \$456,888 of the FY2020 budget is not being rolled forward. \$300,000 of the FY2020 Murray Theater budget is being rolled forward and added to the park pavilion project for new restrooms. The \$500,000 appropriated in the FY2021 for the Murray Theater renovation will be removed from the capital improvements project fund budget.

Please contact me if you would like further explanation of any of these items.