



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

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, November 16, 2010, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Members in Attendance:

Jeff Dredge	Council Chairman
Darren V. Stam	Council Vice Chairman
Jim Brass	Council Member
Jared A. Shaver	Council Member
Krista Dunn	Council Member

Others in Attendance:

Daniel Snarr	Murray City Mayor
Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Michael D. Wagstaff	Council Executive Director
Janet M. Lopez	Council Office
Peri Kinder	Valley Journals
Tim Tingey	Comm & Econ Dev Director
Doug Hill	Public Services Director
Pat Wilson	Finance Director
Trae Stokes	Engineering
Scott Stanger	Engineering
Laynee Jones	H. W. Lochner
Jim Harland	Planning Commission
Tim Taylor	Planning Commission
Kurtis Aoki	Planning Commission
Sheri VanBibber	Planning Commission
Karen Daniels	Planning Commission
Jeff Evans	Planning Commission

Chairman Dredge called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance. Mr. Dredge recognized members of the Planning Commission in attendance, and, for the benefit of new Council Members, asked that each one stand and introduce themselves. Each one did so. Mr. Dredge related his appreciation for their service to the City.

Cottonwood Street Environmental Assessment - Doug Hill and Laynee Jones

Mr. Hill mentioned that Cottonwood Street has been a project of the City for

many years, in fact, going back to the mid 1970s, when it was in the planning stages, there was talk about an additional north-south corridor through Murray. A portion of Cottonwood Street was built with the overpass over 5300 South in the last five years. This was a significant advancement. There is no environmental document to extend Cottonwood Street from Vine Street north to 4500 South. An environmental document will allow the City to use federal funds when it comes to purchasing property or construction. Ten years ago the estimate for the cost of this extension was about \$35 million. Today, it will be significantly higher. It is important to follow the federal process to be eligible for federal funding, which can help to make this project a reality after the environmental document is approved.

Mr. Hill thanked the City Council for their assistance in securing the funds from the 2009 State Legislature. The Mayor, Ms. Wells and Mr. Fountain also worked toward acquiring the funding. It amounts to almost one million dollars for this project. Laynee Jones is with H. W. Lochner who was also the project engineer on building the overpass. Trae Stokes is the Murray project manager who attends many meetings related to Cottonwood Street, and Scott Stanger is a member of the steering committee.

Laynee Jones is the Lochner project manager, and she related her experience on other environmental projects, and getting them through the federal process.

The basic project premise is to improve transportation movements along Cottonwood Street to 4500 South, connecting the Murray City Center District with transit stations and neighborhoods, and to enhance circulation for cars, bicycles and transit within Murray City. The lead agencies include the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). Murray City is a cooperating agency.

This project has been in the works since 1974, when options were considered to improve the north-south connectivity.

Ms. Jones showed a map highlighting the disconnect between Main Street and Cottonwood Street. She noted that the study area is much larger, which is required by the federal environmental process to make sure that a wide range of alternatives are considered to solve the problem at hand. One of the challenges on this project is the number of historic homes, and most of them are concentrated directly between Main and Cottonwood Streets.

Feed back from the public involves relocation, historic impact, noise, size of the road, and what will happen to homes if the final route is down Hanauer or Box Elder. The City Center District plan has a big impetus on this project, and Lochner wants it well coordinated with that. It also serves as the basis to justify the means for this project. FHWA has expressed an interest and excitement about the development plans in downtown with a walkable livable community, which is consistent with FHWA's initiatives for a livable community.

Ms. Jones explained the federal provision Section 4(f), which refers to a federal environmental law that protects parks, recreational areas, wildlife refuges, and historic properties. In the 1950s and 1960s, when the highway network was built, many historic communities were plowed through, and this law arose from that. For this project, with federal money, the Section 4(f) law must be complied with. Ways to protect the historic homes that may be impacted will need consideration. There are a couple of trails to consider in addition to the homes.

The law specifically states that 4(f) resources can only be impacted if there is no other feasible and prudent transportation alternative that meets the needs of the project. There are some practices in place that help make that determination. If any historic resources do have to be impacted, then you must show that you have minimized all possible harm to these resources. Nothing is on paper at this point, however, Ms. Jones stated that it does look as if some resources will be affected.

UDOT and FHWA, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), make the determination related to what properties are Section 4(f) resources. These consultations have begun with SHPO.

FHWA will make the ultimate determination if an alternative meets the purpose and need, and results in the least overall harm. A representative from FHWA attends all meetings and is involved in every step of the process, so that when their signature is required they have no reservations about the final environmental document and decisions.

A purpose and use statement for the project is being developed now, Ms. Jones commented. This includes a lot of facts and figures showing why the project is necessary and what needs will be fulfilled. One issue being pursued currently is fulfilling the requirement to develop, at least, one alternative which avoids impact to all cultural resources. It would mean going west to Commerce Street or east to State Street. Lochner will have to show FHWA that this alternative does not meet the City's purpose. Clearly showing the purpose of the project is very important in the overall process.

The Murray City Center District (MCCD) is to be a walkable complete streets concept with landscape areas, bike lanes and sidewalks. The MCCD is envisioned as the commercial, civic and cultural center of the community, and will be a new mixed-use area intended to enhance physical, social and economic connections by redeveloping downtown into a more vibrant cultural environment. One of the purposes outlined for the Cottonwood Street project is to serve this area.

The public involvement efforts include a project website, and Lochner is very committed and open to obtaining comments from the citizens in the area. There is a website (www.cottonwoodstreetstudy.com) where the public can sign up to receive email updates. A survey was distributed to Box Elder and Hanauer Streets to get an idea of what the community is like, asking community cohesion type questions. There is a stakeholder working group with 10 to 12 residents on it. One meeting has been held explaining the process. It was a very positive meeting, however, the residents are

nervous. Lochner encouraged the residents to stay with the process and be a part of the solution. They are interested in seeing the alternatives on a map. She let them know that the alternatives will not be developed until January or February.

Ms. Jones described a neighborhood outreach event that was held on a Saturday afternoon in September. About 50 people attended that meeting, which was held on the street. Door to door canvassing was completed to each property, leaving a packet of information at each home. A physical mailer was also sent out.

The process is anticipated to last fourteen months, beginning in September 2010. It will take three months to identify needs, and the alternatives will be developed through May of next year. Ms. Jones stated that they hope to have a preferred alternative that can be published in a document in June, requesting a decision from FHWA in August.

Because this is Mr. Dredge's district, he asked Ms. Jones to notify him through email of community involvement efforts. Ms. Jones responded that he will be added to the stakeholder list for emails that go out one to two times each month. Mr. Hill will forward emails for the stakeholder group to all Council members.

Mr. Hill explained that this is the kick-off meeting for the Cottonwood Street project. He will come back to the Council with progress reports as the process continues. As a land use issue, the Planning Commission will be involved regarding the significant impact on the residential area. He would welcome any comments or suggestions from the Council going forward.

Mr. Tingey asked Ms. Jones what type of involvement the Planning Commission will have beyond hearing about the final study elements. She recommends one to two presentations to the Planning Commission during the alternative phase to get comments, and then a follow-up meeting when the final recommended alternative is identified.

There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Janet M. Lopez
Council Office Administrator