

Murray City Municipal Council Chambers Murray City, Utah

The Municipal Council of Murray City, Utah, met on Tuesday, the 15th day of March, 2011 at 6:30 p.m., for a meeting held in the Murray City Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Roll Call consisted of the following:

| | |
|---------------|----------------------------|
| Jim Brass, | Council Chair |
| Krista Dunn, | Council Member |
| Darren Stam, | Council Member |
| Jared Shaver, | Council Member - Conducted |
| Jeff Dredge, | Council Member |

Others who attended:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Dan Snarr, | Mayor |
| Jan Wells, | Chief of Staff |
| Mike Wagstaff, | Council Director |
| Craig Burnett, | Assistant Police Chief |
| Gil Rodriquez, | Fire Chief |
| Carol Heales, | City Recorder |
| Frank Nakamura, | City Attorney |
| Doug Hill, | Public Services Director |
| Chad Wilkinson, | City Planner |
| Susan Dewey, | Associate Planner |
| Tim Tingey, | Community & Economic Development Director |
| Tim Cosgrove, | Utah State House of Representatives |
| Scouts | |
| Citizens | |

A. OPENING CEREMONIES

1. Pledge of Allegiance - Garrett Watts, Boy Scout

2. Approval of Minutes for February 15, 2011

Mr. Brass made a motion to approve the minutes.
Mr. Stam seconded the motion.

Call vote taken. All Ayes.

3. Special Recognition

Consider a Joint Resolution of the Mayor and the Municipal Council of Murray City, Utah, Recognizing and Declaring March 20 – March 26, 2011 as “Boys and Girls Club Week” in Murray.

Mayor Snarr read the Resolution in its entirety.

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

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales.

 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge
 A Mr. Stam
 A Mr. Brass
 A Mr. Shaver

Motion passed 5-0

Mayor Snarr stated that they do a tremendous amount of good in our community, and he values what they do, particular for families in need who need to have a safe place to go. When he sees the buses picking up the students at the elementary schools, its tender on his heart.

The attending students and staff of the Murray Boys and Girls and Club who were in attendance, and expressed the support they receive from the City.

4. Mr. Shaver stated that there is a tradition in Murray to have the scouts in attendance stand and introduce themselves, their leaders, and what Merit Badges they are working on.

The scouts in attendance introduced themselves and their leaders.

5. Mr. Shaver introduced Representative Tim Cosgrove, Utah State House of Representatives.

Mr. Cosgrove said it was a pleasure to be back home with friends and family; it was a tough year, starting out \$313 million in the hole, and luckily saw revenue growth. We began a base budget of 7% cuts across the board, saw an increase in budget revenues of \$263 million, that left the cuts not so big; we turned back a bad bill-Ms. Wells and Mr. Fountain worked on that with him-House Bill 135, which would have taken a larger portion of Murray's sales tax and redistributed it to areas of higher population and fortunately they were able to turn that one down. That bill would have cost Murray over \$2 million.

Mr. Cosgrove thanked the Council for attending the town hall meetings, and for the Mayor not only attending, but for making himself accessible. He appreciates the City's staff expertise-many times he could turn to them, listening to the City's concerns which was very helpful. He noted that he did not vote for House Bill 477. Mr. Cosgrove also wanted to thank Chief Rodriguez for coming up with the firefighters that day, and was very helpful with some of the issues that they were debating up there.

Mr. Shaver expressed his appreciation to Mr. Cosgrove for what he does in representing the City, and for making himself available to the City. He hopes that everyone will get to know the representatives better, it is the best way to know what is happening-not just in our city, but in the State.

Ms. Dunn added: She has had the opportunity, for many years, to work up there during the sessions, representing the Council and working with Mr. Cosgrove; we have some of the best representatives for Murray City that you could ask for. These guys really have the citizens of Murray's best interest in mind. When we have an issue that really affects the community, Mr. Cosgrove and others that represent us, really jump immediately to defend us, or to help us in those areas and as a Council, we, on many occasions, have been the brunt of some of the things that the legislature has done. These things fall on the heads of our residents, when it comes to property taxes and those types of things, and these representatives have done an excellent job in representing us and helping us.

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

None given

Public comment closed

C. CONSENT AGENDA

None scheduled

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

Mr. Shaver asked if Mr. Tingey would like to take the following items together, as they are somewhat related.

Mr. Tingey asked that they be taken together. No objections noted.

1. **A. Consider an Ordinance enacting Chapter 17.170 of the Murray City Municipal Code relating to a City Center District.**

- B. Consider an Ordinance relating to zoning; amends the General Plan from Public-Quasi-Public, Commercial Retail, Residential Single-Family Medium Density, Residential Multi-Family High Density and Office to Mixed Use and amends the Zoning Map from C-D-C, M-G-C and R-M-15 to MCCD for the property located generally between the Trax rail lines to the west, Center Street and Jones Court on the east, 4800 South Street on the north and Little Cottonwood Creek to the south. The area also includes several commercially zoned properties north of 4800 South, Murray, Utah.**

- C. Consider an Ordinance related to the Murray City Center District; enacts Design Review Guidelines.**

Staff presentation of all three items taken together:

Tim Tingey, Economic Development Director

Mr. Tingey stated that this process for the Murray City Center District, and the proposal that it before you tonight, is really the product of a very thorough and inclusive planning process, spanning about two and a half years. It is based upon a vision of creating an area that is different from other areas, creating an area that is a true downtown, providing a variety of uses-including mixed use- related to transit oriented development as well as the transit opportunities that we have close to the area. The focus is to enhance the quality of design as well as creating an area that provides opportunities for transit oriented development in this area.

Mr. Tingey expressed his appreciation to the Council and the Mayor for driving

the vision to create this ordinance, and to the property owners in this area; the citizens provided a lot of extensive input that has been very much appreciated. They had input from stake holder groups, including Intermountain Medical Center, UTA, UDOT, developers-including an organization called Gerding-Edlen, and various commercial and residential provider groups. Based on that, Mr. Tingey will go through a basic outline of the proposal that is before the Council:

The area that is being discussed with this proposal, would create this Murray City Center District with these boundaries in mind: the TRAX line, 4800 South, Cottonwood Creek, Center Street and State Street. The background really goes back to the General Plan-it was a planning document required for the public's understanding, required under state law, and helps decision makers evaluate development proposals implemented as desired for the future of the community. That document that was created several years ago, there was input and information in it that talks about the need to promote efforts to transform the historic downtown. They have also had some unique things happen around the downtown area in the past few years-Intermountain Medical Center being a huge impact to the downtown, as well as the Utah Transit Authority with the opportunities with the TRAX line that is located close to the downtown, and the platform to platform stop with the Frontrunner. We have also had a citizen telephone survey that was done in 2008, it was a scientific study, and there was a lot of input on the downtown area and perceptions of what they wanted to see in the downtown area. Over the past couple of years, they have had a lot of requests from property owners, and you as elected officials, to evaluate the policies in the downtown.

The public involvement: He and Mr. Wilkinson were discussing this today, he doesn't know that he has ever been involved in a process that has involved the public more than this one. You see this public involvement process which is thirteen meetings; seven of which were public input meetings, specifically for public input; it is something that has gone over a long period of time and there has been a lot of discussion and input which has been very much appreciated. It has included the Planning Commission, the Design Review Committee, the Downtown Historic Overlay District and the History Advisory Board. All of these groups, as well as the public input process, were very important for the document and the proposal that you have before you.

The General Plan talks about specific things related to the downtown: it talks about redevelopment and quality design elements for the City - these are components that we have in this plan with these design guidelines that they are proposing tonight. Urban design is an important element of our General Plan; mixed-use development, pedestrian friendly development opportunities and investing in the downtown area; really creating, as a future land use, a mixed-use area for our downtown. That is what the future had identified in this General Plan process.

The process outlined in the ordinance for Design Review goes through a process similar to what we have right now, with major alterations to sites being subject to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness, through a design review process, going to the Design Review Committee and ultimately to the Planning Commission; then we have those as part of the major alterations-new development and substantial changes to a site; minor alterations are reviewed administratively-still going through a Certificate of Appropriateness process, but administratively reviewed. These minor alterations would include, without limitations, lighting, fixtures, signs and awnings. With historic preservation, there are significant changes in this new code; our Downtown Historic Overlay District really focuses on historic preservation. That has changed with what we have proposed tonight; in fact, there are a number of non-significant contributing buildings that have to go through processes right now, if there is a demolition or change proposed, and this ordinance basically peels back historic preservation, and focuses on the most important properties. In fact, around 40 properties have been peeled off of that review process with this proposal that you have tonight, and the focus is on significant buildings that meet these criteria, outlined in our code. Planning Commission approval is required for changes to the exterior on these historic buildings that we are talking about.

Mr. Tingey showed a map with examples of buildings to the audience, explaining that these are important historic structures, which they are focusing on for preservation. The General Plan talks about the importance of historic preservation, and they don't feel that it should be ignored in this plan. They also have a brand new element, as far as the ordinances go, and that is sustainability; the proposed ordinance promotes sustainability, promoting energy efficiency, conservation, and preservation of natural resources including these elements. The one thing that the developers would be interested in, is: is it a requirement to develop LEED buildings or LEED design? It is not a requirement of private development, we are encouraging it in this ordinance, but it is a requirement for public buildings, as proposed, and we have discussed this with you to a silver certification. There are some important elements that they feel are appropriate for all development, including these things, such as standards requiring energy efficient appliances, standards requiring protection of existing water ways and design standards which take advantage of transit opportunities. They are things that make sense, and they are not overly arduous for developers to move forward on.

We have design standards that are in depth in the proposal; the purpose of the design standards is to promote high-density pedestrian transit oriented design. Because they want this area to be different than other areas, we want to be able to have the opportunity to scrutinize to make sure it meets the standards that they are talking about. Those standards include: building and site design, parking, open space, lighting and signage to differentiate this area from other areas. Then we have the design standards: the purpose is to provide guidance to the Design Review Committee and Planning Commission on the proposed development in

the MCCD, provide examples of design that meet the intent of the ordinance, explain more in detail the LEED standards and sustainability, and provide flexibility within a structured framework. There is that flexibility built into this, there are multiple options that can be looked at within the design guidelines. The chapters really focus on sustainability-neighborhood guidelines and design, site, streetscape guidelines, architectural and building materials, and sign guidelines.

In the design guidelines, these are examples; a lot of what we have in the design guidelines are pictures showing examples for developers or for anyone that is developing in the area. This is somewhat of a vision-a conceptual design of what we would like to see, you see the open space with the connection of green space, you see the density opportunities; this is the look and feel we would like see. These are areas that are, even in Utah, that we have; more density is what we are really focusing on in this area. It is an important component of this, especially on the west side of State Street where we have minimum height standards and then podium set-backs if a developer is going quite vertical in their development. The look and feel, in the design guidelines, we want to promote the pedestrian feel, we want to promote activity on the sidewalks-including tables and such if there are restaurants.

The recommendation has been reviewed before the Design Review Committee, the Planning Commission, and the History Advisory Board and they have provided input in this and given their approval; staff recommends approval of the guidelines, the ordinance and the changes in the zoning, with one change: they talk about parking in excess of maximums; parking in excess of 110% with maximums that does not work, so they are proposing this modification to eliminate 'in excess of 110%' to just say 'in excess of the maximum.' They feel that it is an important change.

In summary, this is their recommendation. This area will really be promoting density, that is one of the ways they are looking at differentiating this. The only other thing that Mr. Tingey wanted to mention, as part of Item C, is that they are proposing some changes to the Design Review Committee of the Downtown Historic Overlay District, changing the name to the Murray City Center District; all of the changes in Section 2.68. They also want to eliminate current references to the Board, changing it to a committee, specifying that the committee will provide recommendations on the modifications to the District in ordinance. One item that they are proposing is eliminating the requirement of at least one committee member to be a property resident or business owner in the area, and are eliminating the requirement for at least one member to be a professional in historic preservation/architecture and history. This doesn't mean that we can't have residence down here that own property to a part of this committee, but we don't want that to be a requirement.

Based upon these things, we are recommending approval of all three items above.

Public Hearing opened for public comment

DeLynn Barney, 4902 Box Elder Street, Murray, Utah

Mr. Barney stated that his family has lived on Box Elder Street since 1965; when they first moved here, there was a very significant historic downtown area. They could walk to a grocery store, a Sears store, and with the passage of this ordinance, he sees a final demise of what was left of the historic downtown. The increased high density is going to bring additional people into the area, and with additional people brings additional crime and traffic. Since the IMC has gone in, the street where he lives (South end of Box Elder) the traffic from Vine Street has increased and the speeds have increased significantly. It seems like a fast-access way to get through, and with additional people coming in from the higher density, there is going to be a need for more roads which will significantly decrease the quality of life for the people that live in that area.

With the latter part of this Ordinance-as far as not requiring a local resident that lives in that area to be on the board-it is almost like saying that the City does not want your opinion for our committee or group. He would encourage that this not be accepted, that more than just one small segment of Murray be worked on as far as developing; look at the entire City, not just one very small segment.

Jeff Evans, Murray City Planning and Zoning Commission

Mr. Evans commended Mr. Barney for his input throughout this process, for letting his feelings be known; because of that, he would also like to let the City staff know that it is very much recognized, for someone who has been on the Planning and Zoning Commission as long as he has, of going way out of their way to involve the public in this process. He has seen Mr. Barney come to multiple meetings and open houses, and the fact that those even existed and he is part of the process is fantastic.

He also has to look at this as our city being progressive, being unique, once again; defining ourselves as the island, the community that we have always been that makes everybody want to come here. We have so many advantages as far as connectivity to the rest of the valley, just our central location, the number of freeway accesses we have; the only point in the Frontrunner system other than downtown that is going to have point to point-you can get off the TRAX and get on-there is just so much going on, and he looks at this process as us embracing our past, but also embracing our future in the fact that we are being progressive, forward thinking and rather than having maybe some of the road blocks that we have created by embracing our past, we still maintain that and head in a fast and progressive direction when competition by our other communities in the valley is heavy and strong. He looks at this as a very positive thing, looked at by all our commissions and boards, and multiple public venues, and he feels that this should be unanimously approved, like it was by their Commission.

Public comment closed

Council consideration of the above matter to follow Public Hearing.

Mr. Dredge stated that he has spoken with Mr. Tingey about some concerns he had, and has had his concerns allayed; but as a point of clarification: on the LEED certification, to meet LEED standards, do they have to be certified, or just meet those certification standards?

Mr. Tingey stated that the current proposal that the Council has before them has public buildings facilities meeting the LEED standards and being certified at the silver level. That is the only certification required in the current proposal. All of the rest, there is no requirement for private development; there are elements of sustainability that are required, but there is no certification required on the private side.

Mr. Dredge said that he has some concerns about the costs associated with that certification and the public bearing the burden of those costs. He believes that LEED is important but doesn't necessarily believe that we need to meet that.

Ms. Dunn stated that those costs are designed to be recouped over time, and she feels that we should be a leader in that; where we are not requiring private businesses to do that, without certifying public buildings, you will never get certification in those areas. Without certifying some buildings at least, since you need certified buildings to get certification for the neighborhood distinction of it. She thinks we will see the costs recouped over time.

Mr. Dredge said that in some of the reading that he has done, and again, he is not arguing against the concepts of LEED, but this whole certification process almost seems to be the 'boutique' certification of the day and he wonders, in the long term, whether or not putting that level of overhead on a project may not be as important down the road as the value.

Mr. Brass stated that he cannot disagree that there is a cost to it, he does know that with the rising cost of energy, and he expects to see another big bump after what has happened in the world recently, he thinks it makes sense to look at things that will reduce out energy our energy usage. We are going for more density and if we can cut down the amount of waste water for instance, that extends the life of our water treatment system even, which will save a tremendous amount of money in the long run. He believes that this will pay for itself, he is amazed at the number of people now who are knocking on even the City's door, trying to do audits for us to try and save energy-it is the latest growth business.

But, as Ms. Dunn said, if we don't set a standard it won't get done. We are doing a lot of things right now to assure a process in the future; as Council's change, we need to do the same thing for the design of this downtown.

Ms. Dunn said that he may be correct in saying that it may be the 'boutique' one at the time, but if another certification process comes along, whoever is in the Council's place at that time, can easily say it can be LEED or it can be group B or C that certifies, and there may be some more competition in that. She truly believes that we will recoup the costs over time.

Mr. Dredge stated that he believes there is a return on investment on that, but he wonders if those costs are better served by being invested in infrastructure rather than a piece of paper that says we meet the certification.

Ms. Dunn said that is what we are doing-investing in our infrastructure to get that certification.

Mr. Dredge said that he truly needs help with, it is something that he is struggling with, going back and forth; in saying this, he recognizes that his bent is not exactly towards historic preservation. He says that unapologetically- we all have our bent, and quite frankly, when they did the Historic Overlay District the first time, he voted with the Council even though he had reservations because he recognized that this is not his bent, and he does not necessarily believe that his bent is the right way. As he looks at more or less forcing properties that they don't themselves own or control, to have the standard of a historic building, he has concerns with that. He doesn't necessarily believe that just because something is old that it needs to be preserved and he feels much better about this because there is an option to opt out of it, but he is struggling with the fact that if we are so committed to historic preservation, why are we putting the opt out piece in? It is also very easy for people who have preservationist tendencies to say 'let's do this' when they have no skin in the game-they don't own the properties; if they want to preserve them so badly, buy them and elect in to the preservation process. With that being said, he would like to hear others comments on that.

Ms. Dunn agreed with some of Mr. Dredges points; when they originally put this into place, they got feedback from the committee that anything over 50 years old.....she has tended to lean in the direction he was talking about, many times. At the same time, she visits other places in this country over and over again and having those things that are truly historic preserved, gives you connection to your community, it gives your community something that they can be proud of and look back through history at, and she feels that to an extent, it is very important to a community to have those things. There are many cities in this country that would be nothing if not for their historic background. But she also knows where Mr. Dredge is going with this, and agrees with him to an extent, but those things that are truly historic need to be worked on to preserve in our community. There are a lot of people who have been in this community with their families since it started back 110 years ago, and those things are important to them, and they're important to the people that they mean something to. If it doesn't mean something to her-she's not the only one.

Mr. Dredge said that where his problem is, if someone came down the street and said that his home is historic, thus we are adding this overhead on you; he is not sure he would like

that, and in some respects he sees that we are doing that because there are some people in the community who look at a building and say gosh, that has meaning to me. They do not have to pay for the upkeep, they don't have to jump through whatever the hoops are that are necessary to get it changed should the property owner want it to change; that is where he is struggling with this. He agrees-he is glad that not everyone is like him-saying that's old, let's tear it down and build a new one, he is glad. But he runs head-on into these property rights issues, and the idea that has been running around in his head, honestly, do we, instead of giving people an opportunity to opt out after this ordinance is in place, do we give the property owners a chance to opt out before we enact the ordinance and then subsequent property owners are buying the property knowing that it has that designation, should it be kept historic or have the opportunity to elect historic designation, once they have purchased the property.

Mr. Shaver restated: the issue is not that you purchase a building that is an historic building that you want to change or adapt, but having someone in a property that has already been occupied and then someone saying now you are historic. The issue is not so much with history so much as ownership of a property. Is that correct?

Mr. Tingey clarified: related to the discussion on opting out, in this ordinance, we are trying to balance out a variety of things; we really want to promote redevelopment in this area, we really want to promote density, and there is a balance. Historic preservation is an important part of this area, it creates a sense of place for the community and there may be some buildings that aren't as historic looking or look as great as others, but they are an important element; especially the ones that may have some background that really creates that sense of place. We are looking at a balance, we are looking at economic development, redevelopment versus historic preservation; the focus is historic preservation now, and the opt out element is not necessarily an opt out, it is...if there is a project that is going to enhance Murray, that is going to enhance the tax base, that is going to be good for the downtown, that is going to create what we want to see, then there is an opportunity when that can outweigh the historic preservation side of things. It is as simple as that. We are not being so rigid in saying it is historic preservation or nothing, it's looking at opportunities and if those opportunities come there is a process. It is pretty strict, it is not something that is going to be that easy- and in addition to that, there are going to be developers that like develop near downtowns and historic areas. We have dealt with some that have interest in this area because of that; he feels that even from an economic development standpoint, there are some very big pluses to having the historic preservation.

Mr. Stam said that the way to opt out is if you have another development. But if you don't feel like your building meets the standards of being a historic building, they do not have the opportunity to opt out.

Mr. Tingey stated that with the buildings that they are proposing in this ordinance right now, no. They are proposed under the historic preservation category to be preserved, unless there is a development project.

Mr. Stam asked if all of these building owners have had an opportunity to state their opinion and whether they want to be included in that.

Mr. Tingey said that they have been invited to meetings, and there has been a lot of opinions about this issue; in fact, one of the persons involved very heavily in the public input process, especially at the Planning Commission, didn't feel like we were doing enough for historic preservation.

Mr. Nakamura stated that constitutionally, there is a provision of undue hardship or if there is extreme hardship that deprives you of the economic use of your property, or that it substantially diminishes the value of your property, you can get out. You are up against the takings law; therefore there is a way. We can't totally deprive you of the total economic use of that property. The government has the right to take into consideration the historic value of a property, but there is a way-if you can show extreme hardship or that it substantially diminishes the value of the property, you can prevail on that, because we as the government cannot deprive you of the total use of the property.

Mr. Dredge said that what we have done is added a level of overhead and costs to the property owner to fight that battle, and he just wonders if that is fair to do.

Mr. Nakamura recommended that as the Council votes on this issue, maybe vote on them separately because there may be different votes on different ordinances because there is some substantive differences; he recommends that you vote on the three of them separately.

Ms. Dunn said, for the public's information on this process: this has been a years long process. It has not been the last six months, it hasn't been the last year, it has been many years. This is something that not only this Council, but the Council before them, as well as staff and administration have studied and worked through and researched and worked with consultants on for many, many years to get to the point where they are at. She, for one, is very excited to have the opportunity to have a downtown that is no longer dead, but that can, at the same time, support some of the neighborhoods that are still there, help them to survive even a little better, make the things around them nice, invite people to walk downtown again like it was 50 years ago, invite people to go downtown and enjoy dinner without having to go to Salt Lake or Sandy or elsewhere.

This process will bring some economic development to this community where we can enjoy the resources and the benefit that it brings to us. This whole, long process has been something that she is very proud of this Council, the Mayor's Office, the staff, the Planning Commission and everyone that has been involved in bringing this together, because she thinks they are going to see some really positive things in this community.

Mr. Brass made a motion to adopt the Ordinance "A" relating to the City Center District, with the one modification as discussed.

Ms. Dunn 2nd the motion.

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales.

 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge
 A Mr. Stam
 A Mr. Brass
 A Mr. Shaver

Motion passed 5-0

Regarding item "B", the Ordinance relating to zoning:

Ms. Dunn made a motion to adopt Ordinance.
Mr. Dredge 2nd the motion.

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales.

 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge
 A Mr. Stam
 A Mr. Brass
 A Mr. Shaver

Motion passed 5-0

Regarding item "C", enacting the Design Review Guidelines including the modifications discussed:

Mr. Brass made a motion to adopt Ordinance.
Mr. Stam 2nd the motion.

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales.

 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge
 A Mr. Stam
 A Mr. Brass
 A Mr. Shaver

Motion passed 5-0

2. **Consider an Ordinance amending Chapter 2.68 of the Murray City Municipal Code relating to the Downtown Historic Overlay Design Review Committee and replacing it with the Murray City Center Design Review Committee.**

Staff presentation: Tim Tingey, Community Economic Development Director.

Mr. Tingey stated is to modify the Design Review Committee as previously mentioned above, to include the wording of the Murray City Center District in this area and eliminating the reference on the Board and Committee. It also eliminates the requirement for at least one committee member to be a property resident or business owner; it doesn't mean that they can't be, just that it is not a requirement in the event that it is difficult to find people to serve on that; it also eliminates that requirement relating to historic preservation, architecture and history. They are recommending approval.

Ms. Dunn asked that Mr. Tingey address, very quickly, why they want those requirements removed.

Mr. Tingey stated that the main thing is not having that in place so we are so tied to certain individuals. We want to have the opportunity, if there are individuals that are passionate about the downtown, that have really good backgrounds in architecture or a variety of different things, that we allow them the opportunity and not restrict ourselves to certain areas or occupations.

Mr. Brass said that another one of the issues that they have found, is that sometimes it is difficult to fill a committee or board; as much as you want representation throughout the City, when we are limited to that, we can't always get somebody to serve. Some of these committees take up a lot of time-as you saw how many meetings the Planning and Zoning Commission attended on just this one item. Rather than not have a committee at all, it gives us a little bit more flexibility. He would still urge that we look for people in that area, but he understands the reasoning.

Public Hearing opened for public comment

None given

Public comment closed

Council consideration of the above matter to follow Public Hearing.

Mr. Brass stated that one of the other issues that they looked at when they started the process, was they have this big hospital just across the street now and anywhere else that you have a hospital of that magnitude, ultimately a lot of stuff goes up around it, and they wanted to have an opportunity to have some input into what the area looked like instead of just having it occur haphazardly. They started down this road and it's had a few bumps but they've made it.

Mr. Dredge stated that he likes the fact that they could open it up to a wider variety of individuals who choose to participate on the committee and maybe not necessarily get all one bent.

Mr. Dredge made a motion to adopt Ordinance with modification.
Mr. Stam 2nd the motion.

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales.

A Ms. Dunn
A Mr. Dredge
A Mr. Stam
A Mr. Brass
A Mr. Shaver

Motion passed 5-0

E. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Consider a Resolution authorizing the execution of an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between the City and the Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands for a grant.**

Staff presentation: Doug Hill, Public Services Director

Mr. Hill stated that the State of Utah has a problem with Black Pine Leaf scale insects, and in particular, there are 130 trees located on public property in Murray City throughout of parks, golf courses, and Jordan River Parkway area that are infected with this insect. The State of Utah is trying to suppress this problem and has granted Murray City funds in the amount of \$4,175.00 that will allow us to remove some of the trees that are already dead, to plant some new trees and to treat the remaining 130 trees with an insecticide.

The reason that you have this before you is that it is an Interlocal Agreement with the State of Utah; in return for the funds that would be sent to Murray City, we would be required to match those funds at a one-to-one cost, but our costs would be in-kind services, not dollar costs. We would use labor costs and record keeping costs to fulfill our match requirement. They are recommending that this agreement be approved so that they can move forward with placing the insecticide out.

Mr. Stam made a motion to adopt the Resolution.
Mr. Brass 2nd the motion.

Call vote recorded by Carol Heales.

A Ms. Dunn
A Mr. Dredge
A Mr. Stam
A Mr. Brass
A Mr. Shaver

Motion passed 5-0

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None scheduled

G. MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Snarr stated that most of us are aware and excited about the opening of the Mid-Jordan spur line; UTA is holding meetings to take comment from the public, are taking comments on their website, and may hold additional meetings as well because they are going to have to look at some of the other lines that they may be closing on the bus routes. They have had this issue before, up to the east, where they had people come in and express their concerns. We do what we can, but at the end of the day, it's the public comments and UTA that end up making the decision. It impacts the general area in which that Mid-Jordan spur line will be opened.

You are all aware, and to your credit, 4800 South is going to be totally rebuilt this year from Atwood down to 843 East, which takes it to the intersection of Van Winkle; they are now sending out notices to the public on 4800 South that they will be inconvenienced for several months-but the mother of convenience was inconvenience. At this point in time, we are letting them know that their wishes have come true, the road will be rebuilt, and to put up with the inconvenience of having the road construction. Most likely, because of the extent of this project, there will be one way roads and there will be flagging going on. For people that are smart, they will say 'I'm just not going to go down 4800 South.' They can go down 4500 South or take 900 East and come back on Vine Street; there are alternate ways to get to their destination.

We are excited about this project, it is something that has been needed to get done and finally there is a funding mechanism in place to make it happen.

Mayor Snarr said that he had taken another tour of the Larry H. Miller Toyota dealership, they are still committed to being open on the second week of April; he knows that they are serious about that as they were working there on Sunday and they are really trying to push hard to make that happen so that they can immediately go to the task of tearing down the existing dealership and putting a new Honda dealership on that property. There is somebody who has the lease on the current Honda dealership that is anxious to get into that property as well, and they are hoping to get in there by late fall.

Mayor Snarr suggested that people should go over and see how fast the work is being completed on the new commuter rail station; it is amazing what they are doing. Mr. Hill indicated that they will be taking out the current entrance; a portion of that goes back to our Police Training Facility and that will be happening sometime in the next couple of weeks. There will be some inconvenience there, but the adjoining property has been sold and a portion of that grass landscape will be for the new entrance will be used to get back to our property. It will be a beautiful project once it is completed-we are very lucky here in Murray City, to have the synergism that has been created because the transportation corridor dissect our city. Particularly from a public transportation perspective, we are extremely lucky to have a platform to platform transfer between light rail and commuter rail, an authentic one, not one that you have to take a spur line like you do from the intermodal hub downtown to get back to the main line.

H. QUESTIONS OF THE MAYOR

None

Mr. Shaver encouraged the scouts in attendance to address any of the Council after the meeting if they have any questions or comments.

ADJOURNMENT