



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

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, November 10, 2009, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Members in Attendance:

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

Member Excused:

Krista Dunn

Others in Attendance:

Daniel Snarr	Mayor
Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Michael D. Wagstaff	Council Executive Director
Jan Wells	Mayor's Chief of Staff
Janet M. Lopez	Council Office Administrator
Erin McShay	Valley Journals
Cory Bowman	Police/Animal Services
Doug Hill	Public Services Director
Deven Higgins	Police/Animal Services
Ana Arantes	Police/Animal Services
Holly Sizemore	"No More Homeless Pets"
Daye Abbott	"No More Homeless Pets"
Lonnie Bennett	Police/Animal Services
Noel A. Anderson	Citizen
Sharlyn Erikson	Citizen
Josh Degen	Scout
Walker Erikson	Scout
Ryan Schneider	Scout
Pat Wilson	Finance Director
Tim Tingey	Community & Econ Dev. Director
Robin Hutcheson	Fehr & Peers
Craig Burnett	Assistant Police Chief
Jared Shaver	Council Member - Elect
Chris Chesnut	UTA
Darren Stam	Council Member - Elect

Chairman Dredge called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance. Mr. Dredge stated that Ms. Dunn was excused due to out of town travel.

Mr. Dredge announced that there were Boy Scouts in attendance and he asked them to introduce themselves, tell their Troop number, and which merit badge they were working on. The boys were from Troop 93 and working on Citizenship in the Community.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Dredge called for a motion on the minutes from the Committee of the Whole meeting held on October 6, 2009. Ms. Griffiths moved approval as written. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

Addressing the minutes of the Committee of the Whole meeting held on October 20, 2009, Ms. Griffiths moved approval as written. Mr. Robertson seconded, and the motion carried 4-0.

Business Item #1 - Blueprint Jordan River Update - Doug Hill

Mr. Hill stated that the Blueprint Jordan River was formed and adopted by many cities around the valley a couple of years earlier. It is a guiding document on how to treat the Jordan River. A study was put together by Envision Utah, surveying many citizens over the internet. He commented that it was not a statistical study, but people were asked what they wanted on the Jordan River, and what their future vision for the River might be. The results of this process were compiled into a document called the Blueprint Jordan River. A presentation was given to the Council regarding this previously.

Mr. Hill's purpose was to provide some updated information since the document was originally adopted. A committee was formed of cities, counties, improvement districts, and other agencies with some interest or with a border along the Jordan River. The original effort of the committee, which has met monthly for a year, was to determine a way to fund and govern the Jordan River. They wanted a regional organization that would decide what happened along the River. Creating a special taxing district was considered. State law does give authority to cities to form special districts, and through an interlocal agreement a special improvement district could have been established. Those living within the district would be taxed, and the district could utilize the money to acquire land, establish land use authority, and maintain the property along the Jordan River. Murray and several other cities objected to creation of a special taxing district.

The next effort was to create a Jordan River Parkway Commission organization. The committee plans to create this commission through interlocal agreements that would have some of the same goals of a special taxing district, the opportunity to

generate funds, not by taxing, but perhaps by assessments to agencies that belong to the commission. The desire is to have some approval and recommendation authority to advise cities and counties on development plans and maintenance.

This draft proposal is included in the Council packets for your perusal. Mr. Hill explained that in meetings with the Mayor's office, Attorney's office, Community and Economic Development and other staff members, some recommendations have been formulated and Murray's comments have been provided to the committee. A copy of the memo that was sent to Blueprint Jordan River was provided for Council Members detailing the concerns that have been raised.

Mr. Hill indicated that the first concern about a commission involves the governance issue. The City does not want a commission to tell the City what to do governing land use and maintenance issues. Murray prefers to have an advisory body, and will be cooperative in sharing ideas and plans, however, the City is not willing to give up control, as some of the committee members desire.

The City is opposed to any kind of taxing district, and Mr. Hill explained that he has asked that any language regarding the creation of a special taxing district be removed.

A question that has arisen is the make-up of the commission. The proposal is for the commission to be 35 to 40 members from the cities, counties, and state agencies. Murray feels this is too large a group to manage. Additionally, it is the City's recommendation that Murray's representative be an elected official, rather than a citizen or staff member. Many citizens attend the meetings and want to be involved, and feel that the elected officials should not make decisions about the Jordan River. This is one of the struggles of the committee.

Mr. Hill related that the other issue has to do with funding, budgeting and spending. The structure of the commission is proposed to be through interlocal agreements approved by the entities. It becomes a future issue for the Council. As the details are worked out, the administration will bring that agreement forward with the staff recommendations, therefore, the Council will make the decision as to whether the City should be part of the commission. Once that agreement is received the administration will peruse the details and determine the advantages and disadvantages. Funding commitments will likely be a part of the interlocal agreement.

In Utah County there is a similar commission for the Utah Lake Mr. Hill added. Membership is through interlocal agreements and a fee is assessed based on population, and how much of the city borders the lake. Members must make an annual payment to the commission. This money has been used to hire an executive director who focuses on the Utah Lake. This may be the ultimate goal of the current Jordan River committee, to employ a director who would work with the cities on policy directives, goals, and objectives.

Mr. Hill concluded that this is an update so that the Council is informed when the interlocal agreement comes before them in the future. He admitted that some cities are opposed to being a part of this commission, due to some skepticism regarding the goals of the commission, and relinquishing authority on land use matters. Committee members recommend the creation of this commission, and the interlocal agreement for the involved entities.

Mr. Hill and Mr. Tingey have been attending the meetings and representing Murray on the committee.

Mr. Dredge asked who is driving this commission. Mr. Hill responded that those behind it include Envision Utah and Salt Lake County. Co-chairs of the committee are Jenny Wilson, and a land developer named Chris McCandless. Also, involved from the County is David Wilde. These people form the executive committee, and they spearhead the meetings and agendas.

Mr. Hill remarked that one of the benefits of creating a commission is that the cities may either participate or opt not to participate. Those cities that want to enter into the interlocal agreement may do so without approval from all of the cities.

**Business Item #2 - Taylorsville/Murray Transit Alternatives Analysis -
Tim Tingey**

Mr. Tingey reviewed that the City Council allocated funding for the Transit Alternatives Analysis. Fehr and Peers has gone through the planning process and a final report, with future steps, would be presented that day.

Robin Hutcheson, with Fehr and Peers, transportation planning consultants, stated that the analysis for the Taylorsville/Murray transit connection was completed and she would review the study, and present the locally preferred alternative. Finally, she and Chris Chesnut, from Utah Transit Authority (UTA), would address the next steps.

Ms. Hutcheson stated that the entire process was a year-long cooperative effort with representatives from Taylorsville, Murray, and the County participating in the monthly steering committee meetings. Tim Tingey and Scott Stanger were regular attendees. Doug Hill attended occasionally, and Mr. Dredge was part of the policy committee. Elements of the study included visiting the stakeholders, attending Chamber of Commerce meetings, and conducting one on one interviews with residents. There was one major public open house, and mobile outreach events at Intermountain Medical Center (IMC), and Salt Lake Community College (SLCC).

A transit project should accomplish the following five goals:

- Connectivity
- Economic development
- Mobility
- Increasing or enhancing frequency and reliability
- Approving multi modal transportation options

The technical team took the goals and put together the best transit alternatives. There were many alternatives at the beginning, narrowing down and becoming more technical, until the final alternative was determined. Monorail, high speed rail, street cars, and light rail were all considered. The mode chosen was bus rapid transit (BRT). The BRT provides many of the features of light rail at a fraction of the cost. The rider ship projections were studied for each mode and this provided the most cost effective solution.

A number of routes were contemplated with four primary alternatives studied in depth. One line at 3900 South, another at 4500 South, and Fireclay areas were considered, always connecting Sorensen Business Park and SLCC. These populations were very important to the study. The team then considered creating a truly multi model hub of activity at the IMC, with commuter rail, light rail, and BRT converging. This did become the top performer, meeting many of the goals and needs of the study. Connecting these modes of transit was important. Consulting with Murray City continued and the final alternative was determined (as shown on a power point map).

The route of the locally preferred alternative includes a piece that extends into the Murray City center. The zoning and land use changes proposed to take place made a compelling reason to do this, and add many riders. The extension is expected to be fairly productive.

Ms. Hutcheson explained that the shaded area will be run shared with auto traffic. Other areas are free from traffic, operating in its own lane. BRT will have a transit signal priority, allowing it to move through signals faster than cars with an advantage in travel time.

The locally preferred alternative (LPA) was selected because of the following features:

- Best connection to regional transit
- Fastest travel time to downtown Salt Lake City, using commuter rail
- Highest mode of new riders to the system
- Most potential for positive lane changes associated with transit

There are some engineering constraints along Murray Boulevard that will need attention during the preliminary and conceptual engineering process. Some parking may have to be removed in order to get the exclusive lane through.

Ms. Hutcheson stated that the process is about 25% completed, therefore, much additional study, design and engineering still needs to be completed.

The BRT is about four miles long, rider ship should be between 3,300 and 4,300 commuters, travel time is 10 to 13 minutes, and with seven stations, makes the preliminary cost about \$52 million, estimated Ms. Hutcheson. She guaranteed that the numbers would change as the concept is developed further. This gives an idea of the overall project.

The policy committee, stakeholders, steering, and technical committees were all invited to talk about how to keep the project moving forward. Taylorsville is very excited about the project, therefore, some ways to continue working toward the final goal have been established to keep this project on the radar for UTA. There are many demands on UTA for transit plans. Ms. Hutcheson commented that UTA had been warned that this LPA would be the likely choice, and some connections would be necessary. Their design is almost complete, however, it will be important for this system to integrate with commuter rail.

As the Council considers the future of Murray downtown, some space for the BRT will be needed and possibly to turn it, as well. This is simple right of way preservation. Keep an eye on this as development proposals come into the City. Look for ways to provide pedestrian access to transit. This environment must be emphasized in planning. Design on Murray Boulevard will affect the cross section of the street. Being persistent on the transit project pays off.

Chris Chesnut, of UTA, stated that implementation on capital projects like this one is anywhere from eight to ten years. The next step taken will depend upon what types of funding the cities want to pursue. Funding is difficult at this time and that is no different with UTA. This project is near the top of the list for UTA construction. The process is a little further behind than the Salt Lake City streetcar. The next step, no matter which funding source is used, is to approve a non binding resolution to support the mode, stations, and alignment of the project. This will include the cities, County, and the Wasatch Front Regional Council. Once this locally preferred alternative (LPA) is approved, environmental work will begin. Engineering and design follows that.

Ms. Hutcheson added that the non binding resolution to adopt the LPA would come before the Council at the next meeting.

Mr. Dredge clarified that the BRT is about \$7.5 million per mile. He asked what the cost for light rail runs. In street or exclusive right of way makes a difference, however, on average it is \$35 to \$40 million per mile.

Mr. Hill commented that for a frame of reference, the process is similar to how the Mid-Jordan Line developed. There was an LPA established with a terminus point in

Murray City, and a non binding resolution was adopted. Following that, the preliminary engineering agreement was approved, with UTA, Murray, Kennecott, West Jordan, and Midvale all contributing money. Once the final engineering was completed, UTA was able to obtain federal funding for the construction, which is being built today.

Mr. Chesnut stated that it is the exact same process, which is standard federal process for construction of capital projects. Ms. Hutcheson added that the environmental study is also included when the preliminary engineering is conducted.

**Business Item #3 - Trap, Neuter and Return Program - Animal Control -
Pete Fondaco and Ana Arantes**

Chief Fondaco explained that the Animal Control officers have been given the task to make the Murray City Shelter as close to no-kill as can be done. This is a program toward that goal. Ana Arantes has spearheaded the project and will give the presentation on "Trap, Neuter and Return."

Ms. Arantes stated that currently 100% of feral cats are euthanized. These cats are not socialized. They are born in the wild, or abandoned by owners. At the shelter about 71% of the cats entering the shelter are feral. Much money is spent on feeding, euthanizing, and disposing of the feral cats. Space is limited and four to five cats can be housed in a double cage. It is not the best environment for them.

Feral cats can have about three cats per litter, and the only option is trap and kill. Last year 270 feral cats were euthanized at cost of about \$21,600 to Murray City. Many people refuse to catch the cats. It is about \$80 to pick up, and dispose of these cats.

The trap and kill cat numbers are not decreasing. If all cats are not trapped those left behind will reproduce for the food available. The City has about the same number year after year, Ms. Arantes commented.

Trap, neuter and return (TNR) has been proven throughout the United States to reduce the feral cat population.

TNR is a program that will execute the following measures:

- Trap the cats
- Screen for illness
- Spay or neuter
- Vaccinate
- Release to a care giver

Ms. Arantes explained that it is all based on volunteer work with people who are willing to feed and shelter the feral cat colony. The care givers are educated, and

monitored for proper care of feral colonies. There will be no new litters and any cats entering the colony will be vaccinated.

The TNR program will:

- Prevent newborns
- Keep new cats from entering colonies
- Reduce cats by attrition
- Reduce nuisances caused by unsterilized cats (noise, odors, roaming)
- People consider this an ethical alternative

Many people are already managing feral colonies, sterilizing, and feeding, however, this is actually illegal. There is no ordinance for it. By having the colonies registered, making sure they are cared for properly, the numbers will be reduced.

“No More Homeless Pets” is a program of the Utah Coalition for Animals, and has been implemented in Salt Lake County and West Valley City where it is very successful.

Holly Sizemore, representing the Utah Coalition for Animals, stated that the organization runs public/private partnership programs. The West Valley program has been in operation since 2004, with good history and data. This pilot project created the excitement for other communities, seeing that the plan can be successful in reducing the number of cats over the long term.

Salt Lake City funds the program, and the shelter refers hot spots to the No More Homeless Pets in Utah (NMHPU) organization. NMHPU goes into the community door to door asking about the cat problem. The program helps both the care giver, and the complainant by reducing the problem where they are not wanted. The shelter directors in West Valley City and Salt Lake County feel this is a very successful program with cat intake going down and cat euthanasia decreasing. Repeat funding will be available for the project.

Daye Abbott stated that in Salt Lake City more than 800 cats were trapped in the TNR program. They were sterilized, vaccinated for rabies and distemper, and released back into the communities. The cat intake has decreased by 15.4% in Salt Lake City. By state mandate the cats must be housed, and fed for three days prior to euthanasia, and disposal. In Murray City, that cost is estimated to be \$80 per cat. In Salt Lake City, 17% of the cats went back out of the shelter alive, either by adoption, release, or return to an owner. By reducing the number of feral cats, more time can be devoted to adoptable cats.

In West Valley City, intake has decreased by 30% since 2006, and euthanasia has decreased by 45%, which amounts to 1,750 cats.

Ms. Sizemore added that, because of the overall economy, in 2008 there were 6,000 more cats entering Utah shelters, due to abandonment. These statistics are even more impressive in light of the economic challenges.

Ms. Arantes stated that the Murray City Animal Control request is for \$5,000 per year to sterilize about 150 cats. The intake of about 270 feral cats per year should be reduced by about 50%. By adopting the TNR program, the shelter staff will have more time with adoptable pets, less feral cats, and another option to give people. Approval of the Ordinance will also make it legal for people to care for the feral cat colonies.

Moab uses this program and has run it as a pilot for many years. Previously, Moab euthanized 97% of all cats entering the shelter. Currently, they save 97% of all cats in the shelter. This is directly attributed to the aggressive TNR program. Ms. Sizemore stated that this is now legalized in unincorporated Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, West Valley City, Hyrum, St. George, Ivans, Taylorsville, and is definitely the way of the future.

Mr. Dredge asked if the request is for \$5,000 additional funding for the year, and whether that is part of the police budget request. Chief Fondaco responded that since the TNR will start mid way through the year, \$2,500 is already covered for this fiscal year. The actual funding request will be in the next fiscal year beginning in July 2010.

Mr. Dredge ask what the difference in cost is between the trap and kill, and TNR processes. The TNR is about a \$50 cost for the City, however, the private sector is then more willing to help out, and volunteer time and energy. The trap and kill expense is estimated at \$80, therefore, in the end, it is a \$30 savings per cat.

Mayor Snarr asked how this program will be publicized. Ms. Arantes stated that identifying the hot spots are key. Word of mouth works well in the beginning, and later the NMHPU will facilitate promotion.

Mr. Shaver asked about the budgeting, stating that the increase was requested for \$5,000, however if the euthanasia is not done, then there should actually be a savings. It was pointed out that there would be different line item requests in the budget. Over the long term a cash savings would be realized.

Mr. Dredge thanked everyone for their attendance and presentations, and adjourned the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

Janet M. Lopez
Council Office Administrator